

whatever;
er descrip-
imported,
hich they
clared lia-

ng respec-
Information
the Ma-
provision-
given that
or her co-

certificates of
ir ports of

I not con-

that the
d nor her
ommerce,
the place
lly came,
n in proof
and the
bey were
gin to the
They are
e said de-

es relate
anner in
o be car-
e Direc-
anders of
e is dated
[

the Su-

French,
r which
regard to
ns—that
t solemn
respect
ce, con-
de, they
eaceable
tes, im-
ost dis-
fortunate
ns and
at they
sanctity
honour,
umanity

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XV. No. 16.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1809. [Price 1s.

"Lord CASTLEREAGH supported the opinion, that such a CONSPIRACY did exist, with the determined object of running down the characters of the princes of the blood, and through them to destroy the monarchical branch of the constitution. Having failed in the attempt to injure it by open force, they now proceeded to sap and undermine it by the diffusion of seditious libels, converting the noble attributes of a free press to the most dangerous and detestable purposes. H. r. h. the Commander in Chief was the principal object of their rancorous invective. To his prejudice facts were falsified, and motives attributed to him of which his very nature was incapable. As to the observation of the hon. gent. that the crown lawyers had not done their duty in not prosecuting libellers, he had only to say, that it was not always easy to convict upon an obvious libel, as a very small portion of legal knowledge united with some ingenuity, would be sufficient to defeat a prosecution."—Speech of 27th Jan. 1809, when Mr. Wardle made his Charges.

[577]

[578]

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LORD CASTLEREAGH.—"Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof;" and, in spite of my most anxious wish to put upon record, in the Register, the remaining Cases of the York Inquiry, other matter, of the same sort, presses forward continually upon me, and, with new and irresistible claims, contends for the preference. Amongst all the cases, however, which demand immediate notice, that of this Lord Castlereagh, is certainly entitled to the first place.—But, before I enter upon it I must explain some circumstances, which may not be generally known.—The case is that of a transaction of proffered *barter*; in which, as the dealers in live-stock term it, a *swap* was intended to be made of an East India *Writership* for a *Seat in the House of Commons*.—Now, reader, you should be informed, that a *Writership* is an office under the East India Company, of which offices there are many, and which are all bestowed by the East India *Directors*, who are a kind of ministers, or rulers, in the affairs of the Company. The people of England pay, though in a circuitous way, all the salaries of these *Writers* and for all that is gained by all the persons, who go to India and get rich there. So that, when you see what is called a *Nabob* come and settle in this country, you see a man who has got all his means out of the *taxes* raised in England, the East India establishment being, like many other establishments, nothing more than a round-about channel, through which the fruits of the general labour and incomes of the people go into the pockets of individuals. This fact it will be necessary for you to bear in mind, in order to be able to form a correct judgment as to how you and your family and neighbours are affected by the abuse of which I am about to speak somewhat in detail.—The East

India *Directors* are *sworn* not to sell *Writerships*; but, to dispose of those offices for the good of the service, and to such persons, of course, as are well qualified, from their probity, as well as their talents, to fill places of great trust and confidence. These *Writers* are clerks, sent out to India, where they have the management of the Company's business; where they *collect taxes* from the people; and where, when they arrive at high situations, they exercise great and fearful authority over the people.—You will allow, that it is very fitting, that persons, who are to fill such posts, should not be needy and greedily adventurers; that they should be men of honour as well as men of sense; and, that they should come recommended by these qualities, and not by a sum of money, in the shape of a bribe.—This is what ought to be; and, the principle, indeed the *law* is, that this shall be, and, to secure the fulfilment of the law, the *Directors* are even *sworn* not to sell any of these offices.—How far the practice has corresponded with the theory, you will soon see; and, I beg you not to be surprized, if you find the affairs of the East India Company to exhibit symptoms very little better, than those exhibited in the affairs of the army, as connected with the establishment in Gloucester Place.—It will not be forgotten, that, when DONOVAN (our old friend, Donovan !) came to be examined at the bar of the House of Commons, it appeared, that he had been concerned in the *Sale of Writerships*, as well as of military commissions and promotions. The East India *Directors*, many of whom, to our great misfortune, are in the House, seemed thunderstruck at the fact; well knowing that they were *sworn* not to sell any such offices. At this I, for my part, was quite surprized, seeing that, for many

T

years past, these offices, both *Writerships* and *Cadetships* (the latter being a military office in the East Indies) have been *advertised* for sale, or for purchase, in every news-paper in the kingdom, just in the same way and with as little disguise, as horses or houses are advertised.—Nevertheless, as the thing was come out, there was no shuffling it off. Inquiry was called for in the East India department as well as in that of the army; and Mrs. Clarke having given the ministers a pretty good sample of the effects of their examinations at the *bar* of the House, it was resolved to form a distinct Committee, in a separate apartment of the House, for the purpose of prosecuting this Inquiry. The Committee, so appointed, made their Report on the 23rd of March, which Report, together with the Evidence, consisting of 238 folio pages, I have now before me.

—From this valuable book, it appears, that, though there be no positive proof of the Directors having actually sold any of the offices, which they had taken an oath not to sell; yet, that they *gave* them to persons, who did *sell* them, and to persons, too, whom they must have known to be incapable of filling the offices themselves. For instance, the Director THELLUSON gave *three* writerships to MR. WOODFORD, his cousin. Mr. Woodford sold the first for 3,500*l.* the second for 3,000*l.* and he disposed of the third to a MR. TAHOURDIN, upon the latter undertaking to procure, for a friend of Mr. Woodford, the next presentation to a *church living* of the value of 300*l.* a year.—The public have seen Mr. Woodford's statement, and to that I refer them, for the present, it being my object now to fix the attention of the reader to the Case of LORD CASTLEREAGH.

—By-and-by, when I come to lay other cases before the public, the *Reverend Dr. LOCKE* of Farnham in Surrey (my native town,) and a *Reverend THOMAS LLOYD*, will be seen purchasing and selling Cadetships, and, of course, will take their proper place upon the list with the Clergymen, whom Mrs. Clarke's affair introduced to a burthened and insulted nation.—I have said that the Directors are not, in these papers, proved to have sold the places themselves; but, that they are proved to have given them to persons who did sell them, or swap them away. We shall, in a future article upon the subject, see some other *great names* introduced; but, at present we must confine ourselves to LORD CASTLEREAGH; to Lord Castlereagh, who and whose family, have, within the last

thirty years, swallowed *millions* of the public money; to Lord Castlereagh, who is now Secretary of State for the War department, and, of course, one of the chief *advisers of the King*; to Lord Castlereagh, who is a colleague of that Mr. Perceval, who prosecuted the Plymouth Tinman; to Lord Castlereagh, who made the Speech, an extract of which I have taken for my motto; to Lord Castlereagh, who, upon Mr. Wardle's bringing forward his charges, was the loudest amongst those, who cried out “Jacobin Conspiracy,” and who stated “the *difficulties of producing conviction in cases of libel*;” to Lord Castlereagh, whom the Irish have such good reason to remember, and with whom I hope to make every man in England acquainted: Others anon; every one in his turn; but, first of all, let us confine ourselves, let us direct our undivided attention, to the Case of Lord Castlereagh.—This being a case of such importance; it being a case that so clearly exposes to our view the manner, in which *Seats in Parliament* are bargained for; it being a case that goes to the very root of *all* the evils we suffer; all our miseries and all our shame; it being such a case as this, I shall give the whole of the Evidence relating to it. The witnesses are only *three*; namely, a MR. REDING, Lord CLANCARTY, and Lord CASTLEREAGH himself.—I beg the reader to go patiently through all this Evidence. A great deal of it is not *directly* to the main point; but the whole of it is deeply interesting. Observe how familiarly REDING and even the two *Lords* talk of the *truck*. Observe how intimate Reding was with the MARQ. OF SLEICO, and how freely he speaks of the *amount* of the *Writership* and the *Seat*. You will see that REDING produces several letters from the Marquis of Sligo to him; and that he talks of the Marquis's *sole property* in the *Seat*. You see him negotiating with the two *Lords* about the *swap* with as much ease as any two of us negotiate about the *swap* for a horse or a cow. From these little incidents we get the true picture, the life, of the thing; aye, the true picture of our unparalleled degradation.

MR. REDING'S EVIDENCE.

“What was the understood condition of this agreement?—That if the one had not the *Seat*, the other was not to have the *Writership*; that was the way I understood it.

Through whose means was the *Writership* to be procured?—I beg to ask permission, if it is not too great a favour, to wait till I examine my accounts.

Answer to the best of your recollection.—This Writership was to be received from one of the members of the Board of Controul originally. It is a thing that I have no wish to displease this house in, in any shape whatever, but it is hard I should be obliged to disclose the secrets.

It is necessary you should disclose every thing you know; through which of the members of the Board of Controul did you understand this appointment was to be obtained?—The earl of Clancarty.

How did you know it was to be obtained through his means?—I waited upon his lordship, and he wrote to me afterwards to come to him. I wrote to another nobleman, a friend of mine.

Who was that other nobleman?—That nobleman is now dead; it was the marquis of Sligo.

You wrote to him?—I had the honour of being very intimate with him; I told him, if this one thing could be done, I could manage to assist his friend to get the other.

Which was to be got for his friend, the Writership, or the Seat in Parliament?—The Seat in Parliament.

Did he give you any letter to lord Clancarty?—None; the marquis of Sligo called at my house at different times, and we conversed upon this subject, and I received a letter to come to the Board of Controul.

From whom was that letter?—Lord Clancarty. Before I obeyed this note, I waited upon the marquis of Sligo, and told him I had a letter; he said, I know you well, it is my man. I did not know lord Clancarty at that time. In consequence of this letter, I came to the Board of Controul, and several steps of negotiation took place respecting this Seat and this Thing. I did not know that I was doing wrong, for I was not selling the Seat.

What conversation passed between you and lord Clancarty?—We have had so many conversations, that, without reference to my documents, I cannot say; I have any of his notes.

Have you notes relating to this transaction now in your possession?—He does not say any thing further in the notes, but only desiring I will call at such a time.

Then how will looking at those notes enable you to communicate any circumstances to the committee which you cannot now?—Because I generally made some marks and private memorandums, to see where I had to answer, where I had to sit. Perhaps I had a dozen letters or

more, from different people, when I came home.

Did the transaction break off upon this conversation?—It did.

Had you any subsequent conversation on the same subject with lord Clancarty?—I do not think I had, for I understood this man of the name of Davies made a piece of work about it, and I never spoke to Davies; I would not speak in the street, and I desired my servants, if he came, never to let him come into the house. When I met lord Clancarty since, he has said, how do you do, Mr. Reding, nothing more.

Is this a true account of the termination of that transaction?—It is, as far as I can recollect.

Did you mention to lord Clancarty the name of the person for whom you wished this appointment to be obtained in India? I really do not know whether I did or did not.

Recollect yourself.—I have not the power to satisfy myself, whether I did or did not.

Who was the person for whom you wished to procure the appointment?—A Mr. Ogg.

Who is Mr. Ogg?—He is a young gentleman who lived in Gloucester-street, or Devonshire-street, Queen-square, Bloomsbury.

How was he known to you?—He is known to me through the interference of Mr. Davies, of Northumberland-street.

What sum of money was Mr. Ogg to give you for procuring this appointment?—I understood from Mr. Ogg at first it was to be 3,000*l.* at least, from Mr. Davies, then on going to Lloyd's Coffee-house, I found it was to be 3,500*l.* I told them they were all a set of shufflers, for there was a larger sum of money than I knew any thing about, and I would have nothing more to do with it: whether it was pounds or guineas, I do not recollect.

Did your transaction with Mr. Ogg break off in consequence of this circumstance?—No, it did not, my transaction with Mr. Ogg broke off in consequence of lord Clancarty being offended, and I being offended; and besides that, I understood that this man of the name of Davies sent some papers to lord Clancarty, on which I concluded, and all parties concluded, it was most prudent to drop further negotiation upon the subject.

Was any money deposited by Mr. Ogg?—Never; not to me or any body, that I know of.

Were you to receive the whole sum of 3,000*l.* or guineas from Mr. Ogg?—From his friends I was to receive it; but it was not to be put into my pocket, though for the moment I was to receive it, it was to be given in different ways.

In what ways was it to be divided, and between whom?—Some part was to go for agency to Davies.

What part was he to have?—I never mentioned to him to have more than common commission at five per-cent.; another part was to be given to a relation of Mrs. Grove.

What relation?—I do not know how nearly related this young lady was to her.

What was her name?—I am not positive, without looking to documents which I did not think I should want to-day.

What was to be done with the remainder?—Part of it was commission to me.

What part of the sum of 3,000 guineas or pounds had you, distinct to yourself?—A commission.

At the rate of five per-cent.?—Yes; if my friend chose to make a present of more, I should not say a word against it.

Was a commission at five per-cent. upon 3,000*l.* or guineas, all that you expected in return for returning a Member to Parliament?—That was all that I expected to have eventually for myself; if my friend wished to do me any other service, I was very willing to obey his commands.

Was Mr. Ogg, who was to receive the appointment to the East Indies, to pay any more than 3,000 guineas or pounds?—I understood, when I went to Lloyd's Coffee-house, that he was to pay 500 pounds or guineas more, on which I turned my back on all the parties; I would not have any thing more to do with Davies, because I found he meant to deceive me and the parties.

What other parties were concerned, besides Davies?—Mr. Livie, the brother-in-law of Mr. Ogg.

Do you mean, in saying you turned your back upon all the parties, that you turned your back upon Mr. Davies and Mr. Livie?—Yes.

Was there any body besides?—Mr. Ogg was in the room with us.

Did you not continue your negotiation with Mr. Ogg upon this subject?—Mr. Ogg called at my house at different times, and his sister, Mrs. Livie; I did not ever after speak a word to Mr. Davies.

Did the negotiation go on with Mr. Ogg after this time?—No; it died away in

the manner I have stated, in consequence of what passed with lord Clancarty.

Did it die away in consequence of your turning your back upon these parties?—From the circumstance of this Mr. Davies sending to lord Clancarty, I was afraid all our names would be exposed, and I dropped all further negotiation with him.

Did you drop all further negotiation with Mr. Ogg?—Mr. Ogg and I had no further business, from that period to the present.

Was the whole advantage you expected to derive to yourself for returning a Member to Parliament, a commission of five per-cent. upon 3000*l.* or guineas?—I did not even wish that, or ask that at the time; I would do that without, to oblige my friend, without a shilling, and be at any expence to serve him.

What friend are you speaking of?—Lord Sligo.

How could lord Sligo be benefited by returning a Member to Parliament who was a stranger to him?—That was within his own breast; I cannot account for that.

How could you suppose he would be obliged by making such a return to parliament?—He had given me those directions, and I complied with them.

What directions did he give to you?—To negotiate with lord Clancarty.

Was lord Sligo interested in the appointment of Mr. Ogg to India?—How far that was, I cannot answer.

Did you ever hear lord Sligo mention the name of Mr. Ogg?—Lord Sligo and I at various times talked of Mr. Ogg's name without reserve, when I have had the honour of being with him in his room.

Did you first mention the name of Mr. Ogg to lord Sligo, or lord Sligo to you?—I cannot answer that, it is out of my power.

By whom was the name of Mr. Ogg first mentioned to you?—By Mrs. Grove, I think.

Have you any reason to believe that Mr. Ogg was acquainted with lord Sligo?—I do not know; I cannot say that Mr. Ogg was acquainted with lord Sligo, nor I cannot take upon myself to say he was not.

Did you ever see him in company with lord Sligo?—Never.

Did you ever hear lord Sligo talk of him as an acquaintance?—No; I do not suppose lord Sligo would be acquainted with a man, unless it was his own particular friend.

What benefit could lord Sligo derive

from Mr. Ogg's appointment to India?—That I cannot answer.

Was he to receive any part of the 3,000*l.* or guineas?—I do not know that he was.

Do you know that he was not?—I do not know that he was not.

In your answer relating to the distribution of this money, why did you not include the name of lord Sligo, if he was to receive any part of the money?—I do not know now that he was to receive any part of the money.

Did he know what sum was to be paid by Mr. Ogg for the Writership?—I told him. I was with lord Sligo almost every morning, three and four times in the day, and there was not a thing kept unknown from his lordship by myself.

Did you tell him into what shares that money was intended to be divided?—I do not know at this moment whether I have or have not; I would with pleasure tell if I could; perhaps I may find some memorandum by and by, that would throw light upon it. Here are lord Sligo's notes to me.

Did you at any time communicate to lord Sligo that he was to derive any pecuniary advantage in consequence of returning lord Clancarty to parliament?—I always told lord Sligo what was doing: I do not know that I have exactly told him in what way the money was to be divided, or in what shares; I do not remember that I have.

Did you ever see lord Sligo in company with Mrs. Grove?—I do not know that I have; but I was very intimate with the late lord Hawarden, and I have seen the late lord Hawarden in company with lord Sligo, and we have talked on the subject.

On what subject did you talk with lord Hawarden?—On the subject of the return of lord Clancarty to parliament; at that period lord Hawarden wished to go to parliament himself, but he had not it in his power to do that that he wanted to do as a return.

Did you mention the circumstance to lord Hawarden in the presence of lord Sligo?—I was very intimate with lord Hawarden at that period, and had the honour of visiting him, and he visited me, and I told him one morning when he called upon me, that I thought it was in my power to do him that service, and that I would in preference to a gentleman that I knew nothing of; but I believe I did not know at that period, and I asked him whether he would influence his relations, the arch-

bishop his father-in-law, or any other relation, to get a similar thing; I had meetings two or three times upon it, and he told me he could not do it, and I told lord Sligo the same.

Did you communicate to lord Hawarden that you had the disposal of one of lord Sligo's Seats in Parliament?—I did not make use of any such language, but that I thought I had it in my power to do him a service in that way.

Do you know what part of the three thousand pounds or guineas lord Sligo expected to receive for returning lord Clancarty to parliament?—I am at a loss how to answer that question.

What benefit was he to derive from returning lord Clancarty to parliament?—I cannot answer what benefit he was to derive.

Had lord Sligo any conversation with lord Clancarty in your presence?—Lord Clancarty came in one day, to lord Sligo's house, and said when the servant announced his name, here is Mr. Reding; and lord Clancarty asked me how I was, and asked me if I knew a Mrs. somebody, I do not know the name now; I told him I did not; and on the next day, or in a day or two I received an anonymous letter which I suspected came from this very Mr. Davies, lord Sligo was then gone to Ireland; I wrote to him in Ireland, and here is his lordship's answer to that.

Had lord Sligo any conversation with lord Clancarty in your presence?—He had, so far as that, coming in one morning to lord Sligo's house.

Did any conversation pass at that time on the subject of this transaction?—All that I recollect was, lord Clancarty asked me, Do you know a Mrs. somebody; I answered that I did not know such a name; and I took for granted that something unpleasant had occurred from his mentioning a name that I did not know anything about.

How could his mentioning a name that you knew nothing about, give you to understand that something unpleasant had occurred?—Because I did not know the name of this person, and at that time lord Clancarty had done almost with the negotiation; we had dropped it.

Did not you say before, that you had never seen lord Clancarty so as to converse with him, after this negotiation was dropped?—I said I did not see lord Castlereagh; I do not conceive now that it is exactly the same subject; he asked me, at lord Sligo's, whether I knew a Mrs.

somebody, Tipper or some such name, and I told him I did not know such a person. If that is entering into the merits of the thing again, I cannot say as to that. In a few days after this, I received an anonymous letter, threatening that lord Clancarty, lord Sligo, and Mr. Livie and myself, should be exposed, and I took it for granted this threatening letter came from that fellow of the name of Davies, and I never answered it, I took no notice of it; I made some particular inquiries as to the hand-writing, and I took it for granted it was this fellow of the name of Davies; I wrote to lord Sligo, and here is his lordship's answer.

[The letter read, dated the 11th August 1806.]

Do you know lord Sligo's hand-writing? I do; that is his hand-writing, and all those are his hand-writing.

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, Wednesday, read.]

To what place does that allude?—I should imagine, but I will not be positive, the Seat.

Do you not know what it alludes to?—No, I have very few things with me; this is all I could get at; perhaps I may at some future period find some more, which will explain it.

Cannot you take upon yourself to say whether the place to be vacated means a Seat in Parliament or not?—I should imagine it means that.

Who was to vacate that Seat?—I do not know.

Was it a Seat of lord Sligo's?—I do not know whether lord Sligo had any Seats, it was through his influence.

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, Saturday, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, Thursday, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Grafton-street, without date, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Wednesday, read.]

[Note from the marquis of Sligo, dated Thursday, read.]

Are those all the notes you could find of lord Sligo's?—Those are all that I could find in my room now.

What Seat was it that you thought you had it in your power to obtain for lord Clancarty?—I cannot tell where the Seat was, for I never asked lord Sligo; it was through the interest of my friend lord Sligo; I took his word, and offered to pledge myself for every thing he should say, when I said I would enter into a bond

with lord Clancarty.

Were you in habits of great intimacy with lord Sligo?—Yes.

How long have you known him?—Some years.

How long before this transaction?—It may be three or four years, I cannot exactly say.

Do you conceive you were a person much trusted by him?—I never asked lord Sligo to trust me with any thing, his politeness to me was great at all times, he placed his confidence, as you see, in me; I never petitioned for any thing of the kind.

Did you consider him as reposing confidence in you?—I have no doubt that he would pay every reasonable respect to me that may be paid to a man not equal to him in rank, but a man in a middling sphere of life.

Did you consider it as a mark of confidence that he intrusted to you a negotiation of the sort you have mentioned?—If it was not a mark of confidence, I should not have pledged myself to lord Clancarty.

Did you never ask of lord Sligo what Seat it was that he had the command of, which you were to offer to a third person?—I think that would be doubting his integrity, because I have not an idea that lord Sligo would place me in so unhandsome a situation, as to let me offer a thing which he would not enable me to perform.

Did lord Sligo directly authorize you to make an offer to lord Clancarty of this Seat in Parliament?—Doubtless; how could I go to offer such a thing without; if he did not, I would not have done it.

Did he or did he not authorize you?—He did.

Do you know at what time, near this transaction, Mrs. Grove came to England from Ireland?—I absolutely cannot take upon me to say; I was in Ireland with my wife and myself, and we dined with her at different times, and in coming to town we wrote to her from Bath, and when I came to town I made inquiry and found she was at the house of Donovan; I believe it was sir James De Bath told me she was there, when he dined with me one day; and I went to pay my respects to her, and we were in the habits of great friendship.

At what time did that conversation with lord Clancarty pass, relative to the bond; was it in the winter or the summer?—I believe it was at our last meeting, near the time that these notes passed.

Was it before or after Christmas?—It was about the time that the change of Ad-

ministration took place after Mr. Pitt's death; I cannot tell to a day or a month, but it was about that time.

What was the occasion of your first conversation with Mrs. Grove on the subject of any appointment to India?—Really I have been so much in the habit of dining with Mrs. Grove, and being with her five or six times a day, being a sort of half-way house between the city and my house, that I cannot exactly tell.

Was Mrs. Grove acquainted with Mr. Ogg?—She was the first that mentioned Mr. Ogg's name to me.

In consequence of what conversation on your part, or application, did she mention to you the name of Mr. Ogg?—I cannot at this moment tell how that came round; but I am of opinion this person of the name of Donovan was in negotiation with Mr. Ogg, or some branch of his family, and by this the name of Davies was mentioned; I refused seeing Donovan at this period; I held him as much in contempt as I now do the other. Mrs. Grove told me he was not the bad man that I thought, and begged me to see him: the name of Ogg came out, and she begged me to accompany her to Mr. Davies's house, and I did accompany her there.

What passed in that conversation?—Not being willing to let Mrs. Grove know every thing that I had in confidence from my friend, I desired Davies to call upon me the next day; he called at my house the next day, or in a day or two, and we had a long conversation about this subject, by which we agreed to have a meeting at Lloyd's Coffee-house; when I went there, and found the deception of this other 500*l.* I told him they were all a set of people that I would not be seen in the company of, and took myself away.

From whom did you receive information of this other 500*l.*?—It came out in this way: Mr. Livie was not prepared to pay the whole sum; the additional 500*l.* was mentioned, and he said he would pay it at a future time. I said, What 500*l.*? I saw Davies put his foot over, to tread on Mr. Livie's foot; and I saw there was something of deception. I said, I will have nothing to do with you, there is something behind dishonourable; and I took myself away.

Had you any further transaction with Davies, respecting this?—I never spoke to him from that time to this.

Did you state to Mrs. Grove, that you had a Writership at your disposal?—I told Mrs. Grove all about it.

Did you tell her of your conversations with lord Clancarty?—Yes, and how the thing went off; she was highly offended; she said, she would write to lord Clancarty; I said, she had better not mention my name, nor write to him. I knew Mrs. Grove was very intimate with his uncle.

Did you ever see Mrs. Grove in company with lord Clancarty?—I do not know that I have; I know that she is very intimate with Mrs. Burgoyne, who married his uncle.

Did you ever see Mrs. Grove in company with lord Sligo?—Yes, I do believe I have; but I cannot downright take upon me to say that I have.

What part of the money to be paid by Mr. Ogg, was Mrs. Grove to have?—She was to have a loan for some time, till her affairs were arranged; she had a large fortune left her by lord Annesley, and she was embarrassed.

Of how much was her loan to consist?—I do not know at this moment.

Are you sure you cannot recollect what part of the money she was to have, either as a present or a loan?—If I were sure, I would without hesitation tell you, but I am not.

What is the reason you refused to communicate to lord Clancarty, the Seat for which he was to be returned?—Because I was not authorized by my friend.

Do you know for what Seat he was to be returned?—I never asked.

Was Mr. Ogg appointed to the Writership?—No, on the contrary, he was disappointed.

Do you know who was appointed to the Writership?—I do not.

Who settled the shares into which the money, if it was received, was to be distributed?—That was not exactly settled; it was agreed so much money should be received, and when we got it was the time to distribute it; I expected no more than five-per-cent.; I believe Davies expected no more; and, without the money in question, I would go any way to serve my friend.

What part of it was lord Sligo to receive?—I do not know; when the money was got, and he had given away his property, if it was his property, it was with his lordship, to do as he liked, and to judge whether any of us were to have any; he was a very worthy man, and I had not a doubt he would do what was proper.

Do you suppose that he employed you in this transaction, from his friendship to you and his desire to benefit you?—It is

not to be supposed he wanted to do me any harm, when he was always desirous to see me in a morning at any time; I looked upon his friendship as doing me a great honour, and that he was willing to do me a service.

Did he first propose to you that you should undertake this negotiation, or did you propose it to him?—He proposed it to me, because I had not such a thing in my power.

Did he commission you to apply for a Writership to be sold to a person unknown to him, in consideration of which he was to return a person also unknown to him to Parliament?—I do not think lord Clancarty was unknown to him.

Did you conceive from any conversation with lord Sligo, that he had any particular desire, from his friendship to lord Clancarty, to return him to Parliament?—From the many conversations I had with lord Sligo, I have not a doubt he would willingly do lord Clancarty a service; but if things were not done so, lord Clancarty might do this in another way; I did not know myself that I was doing wrong.

What benefit was lord Sligo to derive to himself from this transaction?—It was with lord Sligo to give any body any part of the money; I am sure he was so honourable a man he would not do any thing but what was proper; the thing was entirely at his disposal, and his alone.

Do you mean that the whole money was at his disposal?—Yes, except what was given to Davies, his commission must be paid; and if I had had the remainder of the money, I should have brought it to lord Sligo without hesitation.

Was not Mrs. Grove originally to have a part in this sum of money?—I knew her at that time to be embarrassed, and I meant to assist her with a loan, even out of my own pocket, if this thing did not come at all.

Had you any money in your own pocket at that time, to assist Mrs. Grove or any other person?—Yes, I always had money in my possession since my marriage; I married the daughter of Mr. Fenton.

Have you lent any money to Mrs. Grove?—I never lent her any money; the last time I was in Dublin, she asked me to lend her 500*l.* I told her I was coming home, and that I had no money in Dublin.

Have you had, at any other time in your life, any thing to do with Patronage under the East India Company?—I never in my life went so far as in this thing, and this died away without its being com-

pleted; and I would willingly have nothing more to do with any thing of the kind.”

Now, reader, before you proceed further, stop a little, and reflect upon what this man says. You see, he talks of the distribution of the money, and of a *Commission* that one of the agents was to receive, with the greatest possible ease. He talks, too, of the *honour* and of the *integrity* of the Marquis, who was to sell or swap the Seat in the Commons House of Parliament! This is the *constitution*, is it? Is this what we are to spend our last shilling and to shed the last drop of our blood for? And are we “*conspirators*,” because we do not approve of members of Parliament being *thus* returned? Yes, Lord Castlereagh is to call us *jacobins*, and to lament that he has not sharper libel-laws, because we complain, that such men as Reding and Davies and lord Clancarty and himself have a hand in making laws to tax us.—But, let us proceed to the two lords.

LORD CLANCARTY'S EVIDENCE.

“ In consequence of the examination of Mr. Reding, in which your lordship's name was mentioned frequently, I am desirous in the first place to know when you became acquainted with Mr. Reding?—About the month of October, 1805.

On what occasion did you first become acquainted with that person?—*With respect to obtaining a Seat in Parliament.*

Did you see him frequently upon that occasion?—Three, four, or five times; more than twice certainly.

Did he hold out that he had the power of procuring a Seat in Parliament?—He did; he represented that a friend of his in Parliament, a very respectable man, was desirous of retiring from Parliament, but wished to make that retirement subservient to the object of obtaining a situation for a young man, a relative of his, either a son or a nephew, to the best of my recollection, and stated that if a Writership could be obtained for the party, he would be willing to retire. Having no wish to save any expence upon my part, and having no Writership to dispose of, the negotiation at that time closed.

Was this negotiation renewed with Mr. Reding, and upon what occasion? It was; having mentioned the circumstance to my friend lord Castlereagh, and expressing great disappointment that the Seat could not be obtained, he told me that he had a Writership undisposed of, which, as far as

have no-
ing of the

oceed fur-
upon what
lks of the
of a Com-
was to re-
ease. He

l or swap
of Parlia-
it? Is this
illing and
for? And
we do not
ent being
dereagh is
nt that he
cause we
eding and
self have
us.—But,

ENCE.
ination of
ordship's
I am de-
when you
eding:—
305.

it become
ith respect

upon that
e times;

the power
nt?—He
of his in-
man, was
ent, but
ent to the
ng man,
nephew,
d stated
ined for
o retire.
ce upon
rship to
at time

with Mr.
It was;
e to my
ressing
t, could
e had a
s far as

he himself was concerned, he should be very happy to give me the recommendation to; stating, at the same time, the necessity of the most minute enquiry into the character of the party to be recommended; after various interviews with Mr. Reding, in order to obtain from him the name of the party who was to retire, as well as of the person to be recommended, and not being able to obtain either, the negotiation altogether closed.

Did Mr. Reding, during any part of this negotiation, offer a bond to your Lordship?—No.

Did he at any time offer money for this appointment?—When the negotiation had closed as to the Writership, he asked me whether three thousand guineas, *laid on Lady Clancarty's toilette*, would induce me to give him the Writership, which I very indignantly refused; after which I never saw him in my house once, nor any where except meeting him accidentally at Lord Sligo's.

Did any thing pass between your Lordship and Mr. Reding, at Lord Sligo's?—Yes; lady Clancarty, two or three days after I had thus dismissed Mr. Reding, received a letter, signed, I believe, Charlotte Johnson, offering her £3,000, or guineas, for her influence with me to procure a Writership, and appointing a shop in the Strand to meet the party and receive the money; this letter was of course put into the fire, without any notice being taken of it; but the sum tallying so exactly with that Mr. Reding had offered, and coming so immediately after Mr. Reding's proposal of the same nature, when I met him at lord Sligo's, I desired him to take care not to allow his friends to write any more impudent letters to lady Clancarty; and when he was gone out of the room I apologized to lord Sligo for having made use of such language to a person in his house, and informed him of the reasons for my so doing. Mr. Reding, however, denied having any thing to say to the letter.

Did he ever give you to understand at whose disposal this Seat in Parliament was, which he offered you?—No, never; it was upon that, that the negotiation went off.

Did lord Castlereagh offer you this appointment of a Writership for the purpose of facilitating your being returned to Parliament, if that could be obtained by this means?—Certainly; it being always to be understood that the party was of sufficient respectability to be eligible for the situation.

Did you communicate to Mr. Reding that you had a Writership at your disposal, which you were ready to give to his friend if the person recommended was perfectly eligible, provided the Seat in Parliament could be obtained?—I certainly gave him to understand that I had; or that the thing might be procured.

Did you ever dispose of any Writership?—Never in my life.

Do you recollect whether the name of Mrs. Grove was mentioned in any part of this transaction by Reding?—No, never.

Did you ever hear from Reding the name of the marquis of Sligo, mentioned as connected with this transaction?—Never.

Or the marquis of Bath?—Never; I believe no name of any sort was mentioned to me.

Do you know to whom this Writership, offered to yourself, was afterwards given by lord Castlereagh?—I have not the least knowledge.

LORD CASTLEREAGH'S EVIDENCE.

How did your lordship become acquainted with Mr. Reding?—I think it was in the latter end of the year 1805, that I received a letter from Mr. Reding, which some days afterwards I sent to lord Clancarty; I saw Mr. Reding between the receipt of that letter and the communication of it to lord Clancarty, with this exception, I never had any knowledge whatever of, or intercourse with, Mr. Reding.

What was the subject of Mr. Reding's letter to your Lordship?—I had vacated my Seat on the acceptance of the Seals for the Colonial Department; the object of Mr. Reding's letter was to say, that he thought he had the means of assisting me in coming into Parliament, if I was not already provided with a Seat.

Did any thing pass in your conversation with Mr. Reding, relating to a Writership?—Nothing whatever; I told Mr. Reding I did not want a Seat in Parliament for myself, but that a friend of mine did; I asked him to name the gentleman who proposed to vacate; this he declined till the terms were settled, with which having nothing to do, I inclosed his letter to lord Clancarty, and never saw Mr. Reding afterwards, or had any communication with him.

Had you any conversation with lord Clancarty, as connected with this transaction of Mr. Reding's, in which a Writership was offered to lord Clancarty's nomi-

nation?—I think, some time after I inclosed Mr. Reding's letter to lord Clancarty, lord Clancarty told me he had a negotiation with Mr. Reding, *with a view to procure a Seat in Parliament*, which he said had failed; in as much as the proposition he had made to Mr. Reding, which was of a pecuniary nature, had been declined by the person who was supposed to have the influence to procure the Seat in Parliament.

What passed between your Lordship and lord Clancarty in consequence of this?—I should state, as preliminary to answering that question, that nothing in point of fact ever arose out of the communication I had with lord Clancarty, by which the disposal of any Writership was affected, nor did the nomination to any Writership take place in consequence of that communication. With reference to the question itself having been put to me by the Committee, I feel it my duty to give an explicit answer to it; *that I was induced to place a Writership at lord Clancarty's disposal, and that certainly the impression under which I did it, was, that lord Clancarty's coming into Parliament might be thereby facilitated.* I stated, however, to lord Clancarty that I did not feel that I could recommend any person for a Writership in the East India Company's service, who was not individually and in point of connexions a proper object to receive a political favour of such a nature from a member of the government, and such a person in point of character as the Court of Directors were entitled to expect to be placed in their service, in consequence of any nomination they had placed at my disposal, on which point my decision must be reserved till I knew who the party was that solicited the appointment.

Subject to those qualifications, was it your lordship's intention to have placed this nomination at lord Clancarty's disposal, to be given in consideration for his being returned to Parliament?—*I conceived lord Clancarty, subject to those qualifications, entitled to call upon me for the Writership if it could be of use to him, either for THAT PURPOSE or any other that he was interested about, and which had no relation to a pecuniary transaction.* I must observe, however, that my conversation with lord Clancarty arose out of a particular case stated, and, I believe, was never acted upon by him, otherwise than to ascertain whether that case had any existence in point of fact. I certainly did not conceive, in so placing a Writership at lord Clancarty's disposal,

that it could possibly become the subject either of sale for money, or general barter for a Seat in Parliament.

Do you recollect to whom this Writership was given?—I think, some time afterwards, lord Clancarty told me that he had no wish to dispose of the Writership, and that in consequence of that intimation from him, it was disposed of to the young man who was in my contemplation for this appointment, if no communication of the nature described had taken place between lord Clancarty and myself; and that, in point of fact, the name of the individual appointed to that Writership will be found in the list of the disposal of my Patronage; but I cannot specify the name, as there were two or three appointments of mine at that moment not filled up, and as it never proceeded to the length of my doing any act in furtherance of such a purpose, or to my giving any directions to Mr. Meheux, the assistant secretary of the India Board, to carry such an appointment into effect, I cannot state the particular Writership that would have been so used if it had led to any result; but I can state that any Writership I could have so used was, in point of fact, filled up by a friend of my own perfectly unconnected with the transaction, and that his name stands, in the list before the Committee, probably in the appointments of the subsequent year.

Was the name of Mrs. Grove ever mentioned to your lordship in this transaction?—Never; I never heard the name of Mrs. Grove in my life, till it was mentioned to me in the house of commons a few days since, connected with a story which I know to be false, and which induced me to communicate to the chairman of the Committee the story itself, and to put him in possession of all the means which occurred to me, as best calculated to detect the falsehood and to further the inquiries of the Committee upon that subject.

Was the name of Mr. Davies mentioned to your lordship in this transaction?—I think it was on the same night that I had heard the above story in the house of commons that I found a letter on my table, when I returned home, from a man of the name of Davies, stating that he had been summoned to give evidence before this Committee, with respect to a Board of Control Writership, which was supposed to have been offered or actually sold through Mrs. Grove's agency, and stating his general reluctance to be called upon to give any evidence in which my name was con-

cerned. I immediately wrote an answer to Mr. Davies, to say, that he could not do any service more grateful to me than attending the Committee, and giving them every assistance in his power in executing the purposes of their inquiry, and in detecting the falsehood to which his letter referred ; and I think on the following day I communicated Mr. Davies's letter to the chairman of the Committee ; I had no other knowledge of Mr. Davies, nor ever saw him, and never heard of his name except in that letter.

By the means of any other Writership, has your lordship ever endeavoured to facilitate any other person's coming into Parliament ?—Never in my life ; I never had any communication of such a nature ; nor have I ever had any interference, direct or indirect, in the disposal of any Writership, other than those, a list which is now before the Committee, the appointments to which I apprehend will speak for themselves."

Now, then, how stands this Case ?—Reding tells us, that he made to lord Clancarty, who was then one of the members of the Board of Control ; that is to say, one of the persons whom we pay to see that the East India Company act properly : He tells us, that, to this lord he made the proposal of a swap of a *Seat in Parliament* for an East India *Writership*.—Lord Clancarty tells us, that he became acquainted with Reding in consequence of a proposition, respecting a *Seat in Parliament* ;—that Reding told him of a friend of his (Reding's) who wished to vacate his *Seat*, but wished to make his retirement subservient to the object of obtaining a situation for a young man.—[Stop, here, reader, and observe the *verbosity* of this lord. Why not say, in one word, that he wished to make a *swap*?]—Well, come, my lord, let us hear it.—That he wished to make his retirement subservient to the object of obtaining a situation for a young man, a son or nephew, and added, that if a *Writership* could be obtained for the party, the said friend would willingly retire.—Very well, my noble lord. Very well. Now, upon this villainous proposition being made to you, who was a member of the Board of Control, and who knew that law upon law existed to prevent Seats in Parliament from being obtained through any other means than the free voice of the people ; upon this villainous, this corrupt, this infamous proposition being made to your noble lordship, what did your lord-

ship do ? Did the high blood begin to gallop in your veins, and did you kick the dirty jobber down stairs ; or did you consign his devoted carcass to the foot of a porter ? Neither ! your lordship did neither. But, you tell us, drily, that, having, at that time, no Writership to *dispose of*, the *negociation*, at that time, closed ——Well ! but, reflection told you, that this was not the way for an honest man to become a representative of the people ? Not at all, it seems ; and, you are not ashamed to tell us, that you renewed the *negociation* with Reding ; that, having mentioned the circumstance to your friend, *Lord Castlereagh*, he told you, that he had a Writership undisposed of, to which he would be happy to give you the *recommendation*, but enjoined you to see that the person *recommended* was a proper one. Oh ! yes, yes. It was just so in the case of Mrs. Clarke's and Mr. Donovan's *recommendations*. They were all mighty proper persons, who were promoted through them. All was quite regular too. Mr. BURTON, the Welch Judge, found something most delightful in the promotion of Sammy Carter, her footman, though he found a great deal of fault with the poor lady herself. All her appointments were excellent ; and so, I dare say, Mr. Reding's would have been.—But, my lord, my lord ! Pray explain to us, in the country, who are unused to these refined matters, how it came to pass, that your lordship, who, when you and Mr. Reding had first the mutual honour to meet and to *negociate*, had, "no wish to save any "expence," did, before you had the pleasure of seeing him again, think of mentioning to Lord Castlereagh, that Mr. Reding wanted a *Writership* ?—Well ; but to come to the point ; leaving your lordship to answer this question ; to account for your not half-killing Reding, when he offered to put 3,000*l.* upon your lady's *toilette* ; and for the mild manner in which you reproved him when you accidentally met him afterwards, at the Marquis of Sligo's : leaving all this without any particular comment, let us now come to the point with your lordship. The question put to you is this : "Did Lord Castlereagh offer you this appointment of a *Writership* for the purpose of facilitating your being returned to *parliament*, if that could be obtained by this means?"—Your answer, is, "CERTAINLY."—You are then asked whether you told this to Mr. Reding ; and you say, that you gave him to understand it.—Very well.—And, now, my Lord of Castlereagh, you, who talk of

Jacobin Conspiracies, and who see such great “ difficulties in producing legal conviction in cases of *libel*;” now, my lord, what is it that you have to say; Why, first, that *you* received; you, even you, a Privy Counsellor and a Minister of State, received a letter from Mr. Reding; from the man who offered to lay a 3,000*l.* bribe upon Lady Clancarty’s toilette, and that you sent this letter to Lord Clancarty; though the object of “ the letter was to say that *Mr. Reding had the means of assuring you in coming into parliament?*” You even saw this Mr. Reding, and you did, what? Did not even you kick the jobber out? O, no! You told him, that you did not want a seat, “ *but that a friend of yours did.*” You were supplied with the article, and therefore, you sent the parliament-seat pedlar on to the next door.—Well, what next? Did they deal? Did your friend make a purchase, or a swap? Neither. But, whose fault was it? Why Reding’s; for you tell us, that the negociation failed, “ *in as much as the proposition, which was of a pecuniary nature, had been declined by the person, who was supposed to have the influence to procure the Seat in Parliament,*” and not by your friend Lord Clancarty.—Then what did you do? Did your duty as a Privy Counsellor, as a Minister of State, as a Servant of the king, or as a Representative of the people, induce you to put a stop to this villainous, this illegal, this corrupt, this dirty negociation? No: but, instead of that, “ *you were induced to place a Writership at Lord Clancarty’s disposal, and that certainly the impression, under which you did it, was, that Lord Clancarty’s coming into parliament might THEREBY be facilitated.*” —We want no more. He that wants more than this ought to be a slave all the days of his breath. He ought to be loaded till his back cracks; the lash ought to visit him every hour of the day; the thumb-screw, the picket, the torture, the rack; all, all this and much more he deserves, if this evidence be not sufficient to convince him and to fill him with indignation.—And, are we Conspirators and Jacobins; are we enemies of the “ illustrious House of Brunswick;” do we deserve to be sent to Gloucester or Dorchester jail; ought we to be exposed to the hell of solitary imprisonment, because we express our abhorrence of these things? The constitution says, that “ *the election of members to serve in parliament shall be free;*” but, if Seats can be

bought and sold, or swapped for Writerships, where is this constitution; where is that, to preserve which we are called upon to spend our last shilling and to shed the last drop of our blood?—Well and truly did sir Francis Burdett say, that it was not so much in hard money as in *a traffic of offices*, that the work of corruption was, now-a-days, carried on. Here we have the system, thanks to Mr. Wardle, laid open before us. It is laid bare. We see it as plain as we do our hands and our nails. Some of us knew, before, of its existence, and we all felt its deadly effects. But, until now we had not the ocular demonstration; there was room for the minions of corruption to cavil and deny. Now there is no room for this at all. The man that shall now dare attempt it, must be regarded as a knave or a fool.—But “ *in point of fact,*” say their lordships, *no swap did take place* with Mr. Reding. So it was with the *Tinman of Plymouth*. He only *tendered* a bribe. He did not *give* it. He, too, was capable of the office, and said his intention was to perform all its duties with diligence and probity; but he, though he infringed no *statute*; though he was guilty of no attempt to purchase or sell or barter Seats in Parliament; and, though he was himself an ignorant man, and in no post of public trust; he, poor Hamlin the *Tinman*, was sentenced to pay a fine of a hundred pounds to the king, and to be imprisoned for three months; and this, he was told, was demanded by “ *public justice*,” and in vindication of the *purity* of the times in which we live.—Reader, bear this sentence in your mind. Compare the conduct of the *Tinman* with that of Reding and these lords; and then compare the consequences of their conduct to the parties respectively.—Come forth, you “ *bold divines*,” why do you not come forth, and tell us how these things accord with the principles of the religion you teach us. Not a word will you say. This is *religious*, then, is it, as well as *constitutional*? The persons, who do these things, have all taken that sacrament, and those oaths, you will observe, which the Roman Catholics refuse to take; and for which refusal they are kept out of office. Don’t blame me for thus accusing you. “ Those that are not with us are *against us*;” and, again, I tell you, that when *democrats* were to be attacked, the book-shops teemed with your political sermons. I tell you once more, and I tell you this once for all, that you shall be our *friends*, or you shall be cons-

or Writer;
; where is
alled upon
o shed the
and truly
hat it was
a traffic of
otion was,
we have
ardle, laid
. We see
d our nails.
existence,
cts. But,
ar demon-
the minions
ny. Now
The man
, must be
—But “in
dships, no
ding. So
outh. He
not give it.
, and said
its duties
ne, though
h he was
use or sell
nt ; and,
rant man,
he, poor
sentenced
ounds to
for three
told, was
, and in
times in
s sentence
conduct of
and these
sequences
s respec-
divines;”
d tell us
ne princi-
s. Not a
ous, then,
The per-
all taken
you will
holics re-
usal they
lame me
that are
again, I
ere to be
with your
ce more,
that you
be consi-

dered as our *enemies*. There is no contemptible troop of your body, who have come out to our view in these disclosures; come forth, then, and disclaim them; prove to us, by your works, that you are not partakers in their principles, or be content, that we lump you all together.

—Show me, you trading Anti-Jacobins; shew me in the whole of the list of the miscreants and of the mean and contemptible wretches that have been exhibited to the world, through the means of these Inquiries; shew me, amongst the whole, one single jacobin; one single man that has ever been accused of *jacobinism* or of *disloyalty*. Not one; and THE PRESS, though there are hundreds and hundreds of persons attached to it, some rich and some needy, and all of them possessing more or less of talent and of means of information; the Press is not disgraced by having one man belonging to it found dabbling, even in the smallest degree, in these base transactions.—Of lawyers, of parsons, of soldiers, of doctors, of merchants, of men in office; of all sorts of people and of almost all professions, there are some or one to be found, except that of the Press. There was one bookseller, whose name was, indeed, *mentioned*; but, it was as his having advised the drawer of the Military-Club Address to *abandon the project*, and that drawer was stated to be a *parson*.—The Press has none of the filth of the thing resting upon it. Nothing has it had to do in the corruptions; its only crime is, that it is well known to have paved the way for their exposure; but, and let the fact be well noted, every one of those, who have conspired against it, has, from the highest to the lowest, as far as things have yet gone, been, in due order and degree, severely and justly punished, and thus, I confidently hope, the course of justice will proceed, 'till the nation as well as the Press be righted and avenged.

TRADING ANTI-JACOBINS.—I have long delayed the execution of justice, in a set and formal manner, upon this race of politicians.—I have often called them *traders*, *regular traders*, and the like; and have occasionally shown how dearly the people of England have paid for the “*loyalty*” of the said *traders*. I have said, many times, that they found Anti-Jacobinism a thriving trade; and that, therefore, they were unwilling to give it up. I have pointed out the many efforts, which, from time to time, they have made, to make the people believe, that there was still a jacobin conspiracy going on. Many, and, in-

deed, the greater part of the nation, have long been convinced, that there was no such thing as jacobinism existing in the country, and that the cry of jacobinism, set up against every man, who complained of abuses or corruptions, was a mere lure, a mere contrivance, to deceive honest and uninformed men. But, it was not 'till Mr. Wardle came out with his exposures, that the whole nation saw clearly to the bottom of this villainous deception. It was not until his Charges, which, in the hope of being able to *cry him down*, were answered with a charge of jacobin conspiracy, that the whole mass of the people began to see the detestable fraud, which had so long been practised upon them, and of which many men of great understanding had become the dupe.—Now they are completely undeceived. Now they see, that a *Jacobin* means a man, who endeavours to root out corruptions and to prevent public robbery; and that, as the word imports, an *Anti-Jacobin* means exactly the contrary. Still however, it will be useful to expose the traffick of Anti-Jacobinism. Hitherto we have considered it as something of a *sectarian*, or *political*, nature; but, we are now to abstract our minds from all such associations of ideas, and to consider Anti-Jacobinism merely as a *trade*; a trade in the plain and common acceptation of the word; a mere money-making concern; a calling upon which men enter with no other views than those of Lloyd's and the 'Change, and to which apprentices may be bound in the regular course of law, there being gradations in it from the master tradesman downward, through the foreman and journeyman, to the sweeper and sprinkler of the pavement before the shop.—In this case, as in all others, the best way is to proceed with the stating of *facts*; for, a few facts answer a better purpose, they produce a deeper and juster impression, than can be produced by any general description, from however able a pen it may proceed.—I have, at different times, noticed, and shall hereafter notice, several persons, who have followed, and still do follow, this once flourishing trade. But, if I were called upon to name the tradesman, who has obtained the greatest celebrity in his way, and who most deserves that celebrity; the man who is, in this trade, what Mr. Packwood is in that of razor-strops, truth would compel me to say it was MR. JOHN BOWLES. There are others, who have had great vogue, and have not been without their profits,

such as Mr. Green, Mr. Red-head Yorke, and the co-partnership of the Rev. Messrs. Nares and Beloe (the latter of whom was, sometime since, in the *British Museum*, whereby hangs a tale yet to be told;) there are several clergymen, each of whom has traded very thrivingly upon his own bottom, and there are some others who have carried on the trade, with many journeymen under them; there are Mr. Gentz and that pink of knighthood, Sir Francis D'Ivernois, amongst the foreign traders; but, at the head of the whole most assuredly stands Mr. JOHN BOWLES.—This gentleman was, as the phrase is, *bred to the bar*, but, to use the pun of Admiral Paine, the bar being, I suppose, *bad bread* to him, he changed his calling in or about the year 1792. He appears to have begun, about that time, his manufactory of Anti-Jacobinism, with a pamphlet against TOM PAINE, which being quite to the taste of that minister, who lent, without law, £. 40,000 of the public money, without interest, to two of his then majority in parliament, he made our hero a *Commissioner of Bankrupts*, worth, I believe, about 3 or £. 400 a year.—As yet, however, the *term* Anti-jacobin was not in use. The trade had begun; but there was not a suitable name for it. The traders called themselves friends to their king and country, and the like; but, John Bull loves short appellations; he is everlastingly prone to abbreviate; it was, therefore, necessary to find out an appropriate term whereby to designate the persons engaged in this new and thriving trade; and, to the honour of the Church, be it known, the term Anti-Jacobin was, at last, discovered by a clergyman.—About the year 1796, the trade seemed to be somewhat at a stand, and therefore, the government, as in the case of other useful trades, such as that of printing bank notes, &c. took it, in some sort, under its immediate protection; or rather, it showed an example to be imitated by others. I here allude to the establishment of the "WEEKLY ANTI-JACOBIN" news-paper. This was an era in the history of the trade. Messrs. Canning and Frere (John Hookham) and George Ellis were the principal Directors in this establishment. They were, too, the fabricators of the choice articles, that went from this shop; but, in setting the thing on foot, they were unable to proceed without the experience of Mr. John Bowles, who, from what source the reader may easily judge, found the means of setting all the machines in motion. But, whether the three persons, before men-

tioned, thought that John's weighty matter would be apt to be too heavy for the wire-drawn work in which they excelled, or whether they were afraid that he would, as senior tradesman, and projector of the establishment, aspire to be the head of the firm, they soon jostled him out of the concern, for which, it is said, that John never cordially forgave them. Messrs. Canning & Co. being engaged in other branches of business at the same time, were, however, compelled to have assistance; and, not liking to take an additional partner into the House, they got a respectable journeyman to superintend the business for them, a Mr. WILLIAM GIFFORD, who had written some good poetry and better prose; who was a very sensible, acute, and, I verily believe, a very honest man; who never ought to have been exposed to the necessity of becoming the journeyman of Canning & Co.; and who always appeared to me to be curiously ashamed of the calling.—At the end of 26 Numbers the manufacture stopped, all of a sudden, to the great surprize of every body; but, the fact is, that the raw material was wanting. Messrs. Canning & Co. had expended their stock of epigrams and antitheses, and, in the latter Numbers were reduced to downright punning. Their pride would not suffer them to resort to the stores of their journeyman; and so the thing went out, like the snuff of a candle.—Short, however, as was its duration, it produced a very powerful example. Mr. Wm. Gifford had first a *patent place* given to him; to that was added a *double commissionership of the Lottery*; to that another place in the Household, making, in total amount, about *a thousand pounds a year for life*. Pretty well, I think, for 26 weeks superintendence on the printing and publishing of the droppings of the brains of Mr. Canning, Mr. George Ellis, and Mr. John Hookham Frere, neither of whom ever knew him previous to that time!—Reader, stop here, a moment, and ask yourself if it be any wonder that the taxes are heavy. Ask yourself if it be any wonder, that the land-owners are little more than stewards and collectors for the government. Ask yourself if it be any wonder that family hospitality has ceased, and pauperism has reared its head where plenty, or, at least, comfortable independence, formerly presided.—Are we told by the traders, that these places must have been given to *somebody*, and that, therefore, it makes no difference to us, in point of expence? First, I deny the premises; for, such places should be abolish-

[604]

ity mat-
for the
excelled,
e would,
or of the
d of the
he con-
n never
Canning
branches
e, how-
; and,
partner
ectable
business
o, who
better
acute,
man ;
d to the
man of
peared
alling.
nufac-
e great
act is,
Messrs.
stock of
e lat-
night
r them
rman ;
e snuff
as was
werful
at a pa-
dded a
o that
ng, in
a year
weeks
pub-
ins of
Mr.
whom
—
I ask
taxes
e any
little
r the
any
ased,
where
pend-
told
must
that,
s, in
pre-
lish-

ed as fast, at least, as they become vacant. But, if we admit the premises, the conclusion does not follow; for, if such places must be given to *somebody*, are there not enough disabled officers of the navy or army; are there not enough superannuated servants of the public; are there not enough and enough persons, who have done something for the country, and who are either *pensioned*, or *starving*; are there not enough of these to give such places to?—But, it is useless for us to swell and foam with indignation. Thus it has been, thus it is, thus it will be, and thus it must be, while seats in parliament are to be obtained in the manner negotiated for by Mr. Reding and Lord Clancarty.—Now we come back to the great regular trader, Mr. JOHN BOWLES, who, though he had been jostled out of the firm of Canning & Co., though he was not allowed to take any, or but very little, share in what they sent forth against every man, be his rank what it would, who disapproved of any of the measures of Pitt, he continued to push on a very valuable concern of his own; and, as the booksellers well remember, to their cost, he absolutely inundated the town with his pamphlets. He used to publish pamphlets upon “The Political and *Moral* state of Society at “the end of such and such a year,” in all which pamphlets, though containing some very good stuff, as a sort of pass-port to the rest, he failed not to introduce an abundance of sterling Anti-Jacobinism. In 1804, at the time of one of the Middlesex Elections, he made a grand effort to restore the trade to the flourishing state in which it was in 1797 and 1798; and, failing in that attempt did not discourage him from another in 1806, at another Middlesex Election, when he and his new associate, Redhead, did actually bring forward that very Mr. MELLISH, who was, the other day, so justly treated by the freeholders of the county, met at Hackney.—“Well,” says the reader, “but, really, this must have been “a very honest and zealous man. Say “that his loyalty was purchased; still he “had but 3 or 400*l.* a year, and for that “he was obliged to perform the drudgery “of a Commissioner of Bankrupts. His “loyalty must have been unfeigned and “proceed from principle; for this paltry “sum could hardly keep soul and body “together.”—Now, reader, we come to the point; now we come to the secrets of the trade, as carried on by this active and enterprising Anti-Jacobin, whose real

great occupation was totally unknown to that public, upon whom he so frequently intruded his *moral reflections*.—In the year 1795, there was a *Commission* (a commission is a very convenient thing) appointed for the purpose of superintending the management of *Dutch Property*; that is to say, the cargoes of Dutch ships detained or brought in. These Commissioners were, by an act of parliament, authorized to take such ships and cargoes under their care, to manage, sell, and dispose of the same, according to instructions which they were to receive, from time to time, from the king in council. These Commissioners were five in number, and of the five, John Bowles was one. Let us have all their names, in the language of the Commission: “To our *trusty* and *well-beloved* “James Cranfurd, John Brickwood, Allen “Chatsfield, JOHN BOWLES, and *Alexan-* “*der Baxter*.”—It will seem odd to the public, that this Commission, which began to exist *fourteen years ago*, should have still an existence; but, when that public comes to see the pretty profits which it was, and still is, bringing in, and how much it was the interest of the Commissioners to protract its duration, it will not be at all surprized at that duration. The document which lets us into an authentic account of this Commission, is the Fourth Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, appointed to controul the several branches of the Public Expenditure, which Report, as far as it relates to this matter, will be found inserted in this present number of the Register.—It will be seen, from this Report, that no bargain was made, as to the *compensation*, which these gentry were to receive. They had the handling of property to the gross amount of nearly **THREE MILLIONS** sterling. They were seated at a rich feast, and having nobody to carve for them, they were, it appears, not such fools as to forbear from *helping themselves*, which, I dare say, was exactly what Pitt intended. They had too much modesty to remind the government, that no terms of compensation had been settled; they never, in the course of fourteen years, made any application upon the subject; but, they set to work very early to feathering their nest, by taking into their own pockets *a commission of five per cent.* upon the gross proceeds of their sales, just as if they had been *merchants*, who had got into business *through talents and labour and capital of their own*, instead of being put into business by a stroke of Pitt’s pen.

This would have been pretty well of itself; but, as the Report will show, they used the money besides; that, instead of paying the cash into the Bank of England, and letting it remain there, according to the terms of the Act of Parliament, they kept large balances in their hands, which they employed in various ways, each taking a share of it to his private banker's, and that they, in some cases, *discounted private bills with it*. In short, their total of profits, according to what they *acknowledge to*, would be £133,198, that is £26,639 to each Anti-Jacobin.—There is a trade for you! A trade that requires no stock, other than that of impudence, and no tools but an inkhorn and a goose quill.—The Report will show what are the opinions of the Committee of the House of Commons upon the exorbitancy of these charges, and upon the general conduct of the Anti-Jacobins, by whom they have been made. The Committee prove, that even according to the principles upon which the charge is made, it ought not to be half what the Anti-Jacobins have made it.—The reader will perceive by looking at the Report, which I do beseech him to read, that the *charges upon the sales*; that is to say, the *porterage, cartage, warehouse room, &c.* amounted to £631,239 sterling, and this, he will see, is nearly *one third* of the amount of the net proceeds! Very pretty traders these! And, mind, they charge the country, a *commission of five per cent.* upon *these charges too* as well as upon the net proceeds!—It has been proved before the Committee, that these charges of commission would be unusual and unjust, even if we were to admit the Anti-Jacobins to take the footing of *merchants*; but, reader, is that for one moment to be admitted? What capital did they possess? What advances were they ever required to make, as all commission merchants are? What labour had they ever had to perform in order to get into business?—Again, They charge for the expences of their *establishment* £17,000 exclusive of all the charges upon the sales. What do they mean by this? What did it consist of, but of a house of £200 a year rent, perhaps; coals and candles; a woman to sweep out the place, and a couple of clerks: for, observe, they themselves were *five in number*? How were these things to cost £1,200 a year for 14 years, especially as almost all their business was ended in 1799?—I shall here introduce an article, upon this subject, from the *Times newspaper* of the 18th instant, which

paper, the reader will please to obserre, was that in which John Bowles used to putt off his *loyalty*, and the proprietor of which has very laudably thus eudeavour'd to undeceive his numerous readers. "These Commissioners, it appears, entered upon their office without making any express agreement what they were to be paid; and they continued so to act for twelve years, without ever giving the slightest intimation to government as to what they were taking in the way of remuneration, whilst they were during this time, on their own authority, withdrawing five per cent. from all the gross proceeds of public money that went through their hands. This they have declared to be the usual mercantile commission; whereas it appears on examination that half that sum, viz. two and a half per cent. is the usual mercantile commission, which even they themselves paid to others.—And farther it appears, that by the usual mercantile practices an interest account is kept between merchants selling on commission and their employers; the former paying to the latter the interest of the average balance retained in their hands: whereas these Dutch commissioners retained an immense balance, some part of which they are discovered to have converted to personal gain, even by negotiating private bills of exchange with it; they admit that they never meant to place the whole of the interest actually received, to the national account; and still less that which might have been received from the more active employment of the money. But their intentions will be plain enough from these circumstances: that of the public money employed at interest they made no minute; no proof of such employment appears in their cash book; and when required by the committee, to give an account of their fees and other emoluments, they directly stated that they had "no salary, fees, or emoluments," but that commission, which they denominated the usual one.—And lastly it has been seen, that pending these transactions, the country was so distressed, that Mr. Pitt, the Finance Minister, not knowing how to raise money for the public service, did actually apply to these very commissioners for assistance, which they, with an augmenting balance of £190,000 in their hands, declined to afford him, sealing their possession of such a sum; and refusing the country's money to supply the wants of the country. In

to observe,
wles used to
proprietor of
endeavour-
ous readers,
pears, enter-
out making
t they were
inued so to
ever giving
government
ing in the
t they were
n authority,
rom all the
money that

This they
mercantile
ears on ex-
riz. two and
mercantile
themselves
it appears,
e practices
ween mer-
n and their
ing. to the
ge balance
ereas these
ed an im-
which they
to personal
bills of ex-
hey never
e interest
ional ac-
ich might
ore active
But their
igh from
the public
ide no mi-
it appears
quired by
count of
they di-
o salary,
commis-
he usual
een, that
country
, the Fi-
how to
vice, did
mission-
with an
000 in
m, con-
a sum;
ney to
y. In

what language are we to address such
“men?”

“ That pity they to England shew'd,
“ That pity shew to them.”

“ Oh, JOHN BOWLES! JOHN BOWLES! Little did we think when we were unwittingly inserting thy paragraphs *against jacobins and levellers*, how much thy loyalty was warmed by considerations like these: and even when thou saidst that thou wast no admirer of lord St. Vincent, it hardly occurred to us that he who had driven away the miscreants that gnawed the vitals of the State in one department, might reasonably create terrors in those who were sucking the blood of another. Oh, JOHN BOWLES! JOHN BOWLES!”

Now, reader, leaving this pious man to write his *moral and political State of Society* at the beginning of the year 1809; leaving him to his labours in the Society for the Suppression of Vice, of which he is one of the most zealous members; leaving him to put down bull-baits, village fairs, and two-penny hops, of which he is a mortal enemy, as the people of Peckham, Camberwell, and Dulwich can testify; leaving him to his actings as a Surrey and a Kentish and a Middlesex justice of the peace; leaving his godliness to dictate false assertions about the naked woman at Nottingham, and about the late Duke of Bedford's breaking the Sabbath; leaving him to these occupations, let us proceed to notice one little point in the Report and documents, which, otherwise, may escape public attention. In a paper, laid before the committee, it is said, that the Commissioners trust, that the Committee “will not forget, that two of their number, ‘have been under the necessity of relinquishing their professions, in order to attend to their duty as commissioners.’” Now, I take it for granted, that John is one of these two; and, then, let the reader bear in mind, that John had actually became a *Commissioner of Bankrupts*, before he was a Dutch Commissioner! Would he have done this, if he had had much practice at the *bar*? I will bet him my right hand against his net proceeds, that he never had the pleading of a cause in his life, though he must have been thirty five years old, at least, before he became a Dutch Commissioner. Besides, he has, *during the time*, if not the whole time, that he has been a Dutch Commissioner, been *also* a Commissioner of Bankrupts, and, if I am not much in mistake, he is actually a Commissioner of

Bankrupts at this moment! Well, John, if we do not give full credit to thy professions now, the devil is in us.—The Committee do, indeed, say, that they cannot admit of this plea of compensation for loss of profession; but, why did they not ask, whether the said gentry held no other places under the government? I am persuaded they *all* do at this moment.—But, what a scandalous thing it is, that, when any creature, who calls itself a *lawyer*, is taken into government employ, he is not only to receive the pay of the post, but is to receive compensation for the loss, the imaginary loss, of his profession. Just as if he was *pressed* into the service; just as if he was taken and forced to come to the aid of the country. Thus it is, that the *bar* is enslaved; thus it is that no minister is afraid of legal talents; thus it is that the *bar* is the tool of the government. Men are bred to the law, not for the purpose of being lawyers, but for the purpose of qualifying for a post and a pension under the government. No wonder, that we see, amongst lawyers, what we have recently seen. In short, this is another of the many ways, in which we have been reduced to our present degraded state; from which state we must raise ourselves, or we deserve to perish as a people, and the means of doing which is only to be found in legal, and constitutional, and loyal applications for a Reform in that assembly, where the laws originate; all other remedies having been tried, over and over again, and having been found unavailing.—John Bowles was amongst the loudest of those, who clamoured against Sir Francis Burdett for his phrase about the “*accursed Red Book*,” the leaves of which he wished to tear out. But, John took care not to tell the public, that *his own name* was in that book, in two places, at least. No; it suited John better to say, that Sir Francis wanted to tear out the name of “our good and pious old king;” and, thereupon, to call him a bloody-minded Jacobin. But, now let the reader say, who has done the most injury to the throne; who has brought most discredit upon the government, Sir Francis Burdett or the abusers of Sir Francis Burdett? The Jacobin Baronet, or the Anti-Jacobin friends and associates of the Duke of York and John Bowles?—John has had a longer race than most men like him; his hour is certainly come. During the late busy season, John had quite slipped out of my mind; and this morning, just as I was thinking

U

about beginning an exposure of the affair of the correct Colonel's improvements, at Chelsea, in dropped, from the mail coach, the Case of John and his 5 per-ct. partners, every one of whom is not only a staunch Anti-Jacobin, but belongs also, I am told, to the *Society for the Suppression of Vice*; Anti-Jacobins, Anti-bull-baiters, Anti-boxers, Anti-revellers, and Anti-dancers, Anti-every thing that is calculated to draw the people together, and to afford them a chance of communicating their ideas; Anti-every thing which does not tend to abject subjection.—Thus, Reader, have you the grand Anti-Jacobin before you. He comes out at a fortunate time, and serves as an excellent elucidation of the doctrine of those, who set up the cry of Jacobinism against Mr. Wardle; thanks to whom, thanks to whom be for ever given for having opened the eyes of this blinded nation to the character and conduct of these the very worst of its foes.

LORD FOLKESTONE'S MOTION.—Colonel Gordon, you must have the patience to wait till next week, our immediate attention being demanded by a discussion, in the House of Commons, containing very high matter indeed. In fact, here we shall find the noble Lord endeavouring to go to the heart of the mischief. He and his associates have taken most of the out-works of corruption, owing to the foolish presumption of the enemy full as much as to their own skill and valour; but, his lordship is now laying siege to the body of the place, into which the enemy appears to have drawn all his forces and all his means, as well of offence as defence.

—On the 17th instant, the Order of the day, that is to say, the *business* of the day, being read, which business was to take into further consideration the *Minutes of Evidence respecting the Conduct of the Duke of York*, Lord Folkestone moved, “That a Committee be appointed to inquire into the existence of the corrupt disposal of Offices in the state; of the disposal of Commissions in the Army contrary to the Regulations; and also into the practices relating to Levies; and to report the Minutes of their Evidence, from time to time, to the House;” which motion was seconded by SIR O. MOSELEY.—The reasons for establishing an inquest of this sort, and for having such a man as Lord Folkestone at the head of it, are so manifest, that I need not insert the speech with which his lordship introduced his motion. His lordship asked: “is it possible, that the House of Commons, with the know-

ledge they have obtained, during the late Inquiry, can suffer abuses so flagrant to be daily practised, or permit the past to go unpunished?”—This motion was, however, objected to by MR. PERCEVAL, who is the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the same person, who prosecuted Hamlin, the Tinman.—The objection was, that the motion was too general; too loose; that it would give powers of inquiry too extensive; and, that it ought to have been confined to particular specific objects. In short, that a rummage to the bottom, and through every part of the box, was not proper.—But, let us hear the words of Mr. Perceval himself, as given in the *Statesman* news-paper, which appears to me to contain the fullest report of the debate.—“Mr. Perceval said, ‘that he could not allow the present motion to be put, without declaring his opinion, that it was by no means advisable for the House to agree to it. The Noble Lord grounded his motion on the evidence brought before the Committee appointed to inquire into the conduct of the Duke of York, on these two grounds, ‘that by farther inquiry other individuals might be found out who might be brought to censure or punishment; and ‘that such inquiry would prevent the recurrence of similar abuses in time coming.’—The noble Lord seemed to think a general inquiry necessary without any specific grounds of charge being assigned. Now, he was of opinion that such inquiry could not go to an investigation into the conduct of every individual who might have by chance been concerned in the disposal of any offices. There might be a variety of instances in which persons might have erected themselves into a sort of agency concern, misrepresenting themselves to be authorised by this person and the other, who had power to dispose of offices, while with such persons they had no concern—and in this manner might procure money under the pretence of using their interest with the person who had the actual power of disposing of the office in question, while of this proceeding the person having the gift of the office was utterly ignorant. It might also happen, that the person who had the power of disposing of an office might, as in the case of Mr. Thelusson, give it to a near relation or friend in whom he had confidence, but which might be abused. If the Committee were to institute inquiries of this kind, they would be investigating what they

during the uses so flattered, or permit?" — This was to be by Mr. Chancellor of the person, who can. — The was too general to give powers that it ought to be regular specific charge to the part of the let us hear himself, as paper, which fullest report Perceval said, the present declaring his means advised to it. The motion on the Committee conduct of two grounds, individuals might be present; and ent the re-time com- ed to think without any g assigned. at such in- vestigation individual who concerned in here might which per- selves into representing by this per- power to such per- and in this under the t with the ver of dis- , while of having the ignorant. the person king of an Mr. Thel- son or friend out which committee his kind, what they

[613]

APRIL 22, 1809.—*Lord Folkestone's Motion.*

[614]

"had no right to punish.—ANY FARTHER INQUIRY THEREFORE, HE SUBMITTED, WAS NOT DESIRABLE." He asked, was it convenient or politic to set on foot an inquiry into all abuses that might or might not have happened, for the sake of keeping the public mind in a ferment? (A laugh) Gentlemen might laugh. He was satisfied that there were, on the other side, Gentlemen who would not agree with him in this opinion. He believed that these Gentlemen, from no improper feeling whatever, were of opinion that nothing was to be apprehended from the keeping alive this spirit among the people. He therefore was not surprised that they should differ from him. But, he had stated what he believed, that there was no reason to believe that there were such abuses to be detected as those which the noble Lord suspected; and he submitted it to the FEELING of the House, if from the expectation of discovering abuses, they would agree to set on foot an inquiry. He was of opinion it would not be expedient or proper to do so, and he hoped the House would consider before they assented to it. The other object of the noble Lord was to prevent any farther abuses. The House had a note of this already before them—and farther inquiry might only produce further evidence to the same effect, without shewing any new or more extended system of abuse. On this subject, however, there was a Bill before the House, introduced the day before the recess. He hoped it would be found adequate to every object which might seem to be required. It was not the punishment of past offences, which we should so ardently seek, as remedies and preventatives of such abuses. At all events, it was in the power of the House, and of the noble Lord himself, to consider how far it should be extended. He was, therefore, on the whole, of opinion, that the Inquiry proposed would neither be beneficial nor politic. No particular statement of delinquency had been brought forward, and to a general statement the House could not listen, especially after the Parliamentary Inquiry which had lately taken place." —

I shall leave the reader to make his own remarks upon the words *chance* and *happen*, as applied to the purchase and sale of Offices, and of low agents misrepresenting themselves as acting for men in high station; and, this I may safely do, after

having laid before him, the case of *my lords of Clancarty and Castlereagh and Mr. Reding!*

—As to the argument, that to adopt the motion, would tend to keep alive the ferment in the public mind; they do, then, perceive, that there is such a ferment? They are right; it is a ferment of the mind; it proceeds from the conviction of the public mind; and, as LORD ARCHIBALD HAMILTON said, in answer to Mr. Perceval, "the ferment will certainly be increased, and not diminished, if you attempt to stifle further inquiry." That ferment will, by such attempt, most certainly be still further inflamed. If corruption does exist, can the Chancellor of the Exchequer think that no danger is to be apprehended to this country? Does he think that, if such ferment really exists, it would not be more wise to detect, expose, and punish those abuses which are so strongly suspected to exist? As to the alarming extent of the powers of this Committee—they are, it is true, extensive and general, but they may be revoked at the pleasure of this House. —With respect to the dangers to be apprehended from the fermentation in the minds of the people—those dangers, I will venture to assert, are infinitely less to be dreaded than what must ensue from the people discovering our unwillingness to prosecute inquiry into corruption and abuses.—The only way to satisfy the people, and reconcile them to the endurance of the enormous burdens they sustain, is to shew them that we are sincere in our prosecution of those inquiries that will lead to a general reformation of abuses."

—LORD FOLKESTONE answered all the other objections of Mr. Perceval, in a most able and satisfactory manner, during which he observed, that, as Mr. Perceval seemed to think, that no further abuses, of any sort, did exist, he, of course, ought to be the first for a general inquiry, in order to allay that ferment of which he complained.

—LORD HENRY PETTY (the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, observe: observe that well) joined Mr. Perceval in objecting to the motion, as being too general and sweeping.—MR. WHITBREAD supported the motion of lord Folkestone. He said, "The Chancellor of the Exchequer has acknowledged, that, if inquiry should be instituted, abuses might possibly be traced. This fact, I take it, he has admitted—I shall, however, at any rate, myself assume it. Whatever may be the sentiments in this House, there can be no doubt, that out of it there is an universal feeling of the

“PEOPLE, that various mal-practices would be brought to light by the institution of a *general Inquiry*, such as that which has been moved for by the Noble Lord. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer has argued, that even admitting abuses to be discovered, he should think the appointment of a Committee useless. —‘It is not,’ says he, ‘the punishment of past grievances which we should so ardently seek, as remedies and preventives of a repetition of such abuses.’ Against this, he tells us, it is the very object and foundation of his Bill to provide.—But, much as we know, I must be allowed to question the possibility of his framing any Bill on this subject, which shall be effectual in its provisions, unless we shall first be informed of much more than has hitherto come to our knowledge. And here I conceive the argument which was made use of by the Noble Lord, to be unanswerable. How can you tell, says he, in what manner to frame a Bill to prevent the repetition of abuses, the nature and full extent of which are yet undiscovered? The Chancellor of the Exchequer has told us that *before* the Investigation which has occupied so much of our time and attention, he was informed of certain *nuisances* in the city. He had heard of the office of Messrs. Pollman and Keylock, who were able to dispose of an extensive patronage, for the most corrupt of all things, money, the grand source and medium of all corruption. Now when the existence of that office was first mentioned in this House, it was received with universal levity, it was laughed at on all sides of the House. But the right hon. gentleman on that occasion, so far from betraying the least consciousness of the existence of any such office, did not even countenance the possibility that the representation which was then made could have the slightest foundation; and he laughed, with the rest, at a statement which was so generally received as improbable. That these gents. Messrs. Pollman and Keylock, had carried on this sale of patronage for years, was very well known—and no attempt was made to put a stop to practices so nefarious—no inquiry was ever instituted—till at length —when the investigation took place, it suggested itself to the right hon. gentleman to put a stop to that species of traffic, by the introduction of his promised Bill. Now will any gentleman pretend to say, that these negotiators of patronage may

“not, somewhere or other, have connections either in the army, or the navy, or in the civil departments of the State; for their negotiations it seems were almost universal, which it is highly desirable for this House to know.—When it is considered what facts have come to light with respect to *East India Patronage*, when we reflect on the names that have come out on the inquiry into that subject—can the right honourable gentleman affect surprize that the public mind should be in a state of ferment?”—Mr. TIERNEY, formerly a member of the *Society of Friends of the People*, next spoke, and he opposed the motion of Lord Folkestone. He said, that the motion went to arraign the whole of the government of the country, through all its departments; whereupon, the reporter says there was a loud cry of “hear! hear!” from the ministerial benches. He declared, that he had no wish to screen delinquency, and should have no objection to an inquiry into *specific cases*. “He differed,” he said, “from the gentlemen opposite in many important political subjects, but neither with respect to them, nor with respect to any man, could he agree to this vague sort of motion. HE HIMSELF HAD BEEN IN OFFICE; he knew the responsibility attached to the situation, and was ready to meet any accusation if fairly stated. But this motion extended back—how far nobody knew—and was calculated to put all those, who, for a great number of years back, had been employed in public situations, upon their trial—many of whom were precluded, in the course of nature, from giving those explanations that might be necessary to defend themselves against charges, or to prevent suspicion.”

—Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. T. FOLEY, and Mr. PARNELL, gave their decided support to the motion. Mr. CHARLES W. WYNN opposed the motion, and said, that he had heard, that there might be cases brought forward, which had taken place in Ireland, previous to the Union; cases that might affect Lord Cornwallis and Mr. Pitt, who were in their graves.”—Let us stop here, to make a remark, or two, upon this objection.—Is it not something new, reader, to hear, that delinquencies should not be exposed, because some of the parties are dead? What should we say of the man who objected to a trial for robbery, upon the ground that some of his associates had died previous to the trial? Besides, what harm can any inquiry do to Lord Cornwallis or Pitt?

They are safe under ground, pressed hard down by big heaps of stones, that we have paid for to be placed over them in the shape of *monuments of honour*, voted by this very House of Commons; and shall we be refused a general inquiry into abuses, lest something should *come out* about these men, who have cost us such immense sums, dead as well as living? "What good" can it do? Why, very great good indeed; for, it will enable us to form a correct judgment of the character and the deeds of these men, who enjoyed so much power, and for opposing whose measures and attacking whose characters and conduct so many of the people of this kingdom were so severely punished. There are, moreover, enough and enough living, and these, too, men in great power, who were *actors with them*; who participated in all their public conduct; and, because the former are dead, are the latter to escape the effects of inquiry? Inquiry may redound to their *honour*; but, why object to it then?

—There is no occasion to say any thing more about it. The thing is too plain to be misunderstood by any but downright ideots,

—SIR JOHN ANSTRUTHER, the *late Chief Justice in India*, opposed Lord Folkestone's motion, as did also MR. GEORGE PONSONBY, a part of whose speech, as given in the Statesman news-paper, is too interesting to us not to be inserted here. After stating his objections, upon the ground of the general and loose tendency of the motion, he said: "I find it impossible, on the occasion of so extraordinary a proposition, to content myself with a silent vote, and more especially when I see a disposition in some persons, *not in the House*, to charge every public man in the kingdom with corruption. This is a charge of a most serious nature; and particularly when it is considered how readily and with what avidity every thing that is charged against this House is received out of doors. The people are even industriously told in some places that there is no distinction whatever in this House, that we are all knaves and rogues alike—(Hear! hear! hear!)—that it does not signify in what hands the government is placed; for, provided they are *Parliamentary*, the country can expect nothing but corruption. (Hear! hear! hear!) These, Sir, are most foul, impudent, barefaced, and infamous calumnies; for, I will venture to maintain, that there are in this House, men as *honest*, as *upright*, as *uncorrupt*, and possessing as great integrity as those who make these gross and unfounded charges. And, be he who he

"may, I do assert and maintain, that he is *not an honest public man than I am*, nor do I see the smallest reason why I, or any other member of this House, should hesitate for one moment to repel this *enmerited* and general stigma. My conduct has already proved, in *numerous instances*, that in all matters of public economy and reformation of abuses, I am disposed to go as far in the protection of the people against extravagance and abuse as any man in this country—and I am still disposed to persevere in that conduct, which I conceive to be only a faithful discharge of my duty to the public. But to the motion now before the House I cannot agree."—No; Mr. Ponsonby; no, we do not, indeed we do not say, that you are "all knaves and rogues alike." There is not a man in the whole nation, who, as far as I have observed, has ever said any such thing. Indeed, Sir, you must have been misinformed; and, I really wonder how any one should have induced you to believe any such thing, when the people, in all parts of the kingdom, are passing Resolutions, thanking 125 of the members of the House of Commons for their fidelity to their trust.

—No, Sir, indeed we do not say, or think (God forbid we should!) that all members of parliament are alike; but, I will tell you what we do say, what *all* of us, except those who share in the corruptions, say, and believe, and shall continue to say and to believe; that to *us*-ward, both PARTIES are as much alike as two peas, or two drops of water; that the promises and pledges, which the late ministry, and their adherents, made to us, while they were out of place, they not only forgot the moment they were in place, but laughed us to scorn for expecting that they would fulfil them; that they, who had gained the support of the people by deprecating a waste of the public money, the making of sacrifices for the king's foreign possessions, an employment of foreign troops in the heart of this kingdom, the heavy weight of taxation, and the predominating influence of the crown; that these very men, of whom you were one, did, during the very first session of parliament after their elevation to power, bring in a bill, which bill was passed into a Law, to enable Lord Grenville to hold the Office of Auditor of the Exchequer, a sinecure of 4,000*l.* a year, along with the place of the First Lord of the Treasury, at 6,000*l.* a year; that they settled large pensions upon Mrs. Fox! and her d—d Committee

ters; that they declared, that they would advise the king *never to make a peace*, of which the restoration of *Hanover* to him should not be a condition; that they augmented the then large numbers of German and other foreign troops; that they, who had so solemnly protested against the Income Tax, made its weight upon us nearly double what Pitt had left it; that they screwed up the assessed taxes to the highest degree, and that they attempted to send an exciseman into the house of every creature in the kingdom who had the means of brewing a cag of ale to make merry at the christening of a child; and, that they closed their career by *withdrawing from parliament*, a Bill which they themselves had brought in under a solemn declaration of its necessity to the tranquillity and safety of the kingdom, and which they withdrew for the reason, openly avowed, that the said bill *was not approved of by the king*.—Now, Sir, these facts are undeniable. They admit of no palliation. And, with these facts before us, can we be blamed if we despise those, who would still persuade us to have confidence in *party*?—Sir, in 1804, when there was a sort of coalition intrigue going on for the purpose of jostling the Addingtons out, I sat up part of a night (a thing which I have not done ten times in my life) to write a Letter to warn those with whom you have since been in power, of *their danger*, and of the *danger to the state*, which would arise from any *unprincipled compromise*. In that letter, which was shown to Mr. Fox, Mr. Francis, and others, I pointed out the consequences of a failure, on the part of that party, to fulfil the public expectations. I remember saying: if you go on, or attempt to go on, in the old Pitt track, George Rose and Huskisson will beat you hollow. I remember those very words, or words nearly the same. And, was not that the case? Did they not beat you hollow, sir? Did they not laugh at you? Then, I said, that, if such a thing was attempted, it would disgust the people, who would *lose all confidence in both parties*, and who would very soon see the necessity of flying for protection to other men; very likely to Sir Francis Burdett, and to *many men not yet known in the political world*. I appeal to Mr. Francis, who told me that he had read the letter, whether it did not contain almost these very words.—I mention this to shew, that I have not been capricious in my opinions. I, in that letter, urged the absolute necessity of a *new system*. How anxiously I did la-

bour to make converts to my doctrine! but, alas! I laboured in vain. Well; the consequences are now come and coming thick and fast. A sincere and radical reform then would have prevented what has taken place now; and, a sincere and radical reform now would prevent what, without that reform, will take place at no distant day, as sure as this is ink, wherein I am placing my opinions upon this paper.—Now, Sir, as to your own character and conduct, of which, if the reporter be correct, you thought proper to speak, I have never heard, or said, either harm or good of you; and, in fact, all that I know, relating to you, is, that you were for about fifteen or sixteen months, Lord Chancellor of Ireland, since which time you have received, out of the taxes, and are to continue to receive for that service, a pension of *four thousand pounds sterling a year*.—Frankly I tell you, that I am discontented at this; that it is one amongst the many many charges, which, I think, we ought not, at any time, and especially in times like these, to be obliged to bear; that, seeing that the late ministry did, in their going out, as well as in their coming in and during their abdience, in power, act, towards the people, just as the present ministers do, I like one set of ministers just as well as the other; and that, unless a *change of system* were to take place with a change of men, I even *dread a change of men*, because, at every change, under the present system, new and heavy burdens in consequence of such change, are invariably laid upon the people. —MR. CANNING's speech and the account of the division must be reserved for my next. That speech was in the strain of Mr. TIERNEY's; but, it merits particular notice.—There are also some observations yet to be made upon that part of Mr. Perceval's speech which contains the very novel doctrine, that, in order to prevent *future crimes past crimes* are *not to be punished*.—In the mean while, I cannot refrain from inserting, below, an admirable article from the *Times* news-paper of the 19th instant, upon the subject of this debate.

Botley, 20th April, 1809.

N. B. All the RESOLUTIONS, &c. which have been obligingly sent me, from different places, shall be regularly inserted as fast as I can find room.

FROM THE TIMES, 19th APRIL, 1809.

"The decision upon Lord FOLKESTONE's motion is one of the most politic, funda-

mental than could neral the di led to it wa avoid very We h of ch has be humo to the upon tensib singu might ed in "Gen "mer "lent "a g this c same tain, unive should able is sta NING ed "emo is a " "tha "eve the a eradic truth the su hopel have those we se barga access mothe to say is so only t can in dishon nice are th cions the v were i office trious In his

mentally (though for different reasons than those which were alledged), that could possibly have taken place. A general inquiry, rigorously conducted, into the disposal of offices, might perhaps have led to several unpleasant discoveries, which it was therefore by all means useful to avoid; and both parties seemed to be very strongly impressed with this idea. We heard no more of courting inquiry—of challenging publicity; one sacrifice has been unluckily made to this bragging humour, and that will serve as a warning to those who remain—But the principle upon which the proposed inquiry was ostensibly smothered, seems to be a very singular one, and to most apprehensions might with greater reason have been urged in favour of the prosecution of it. “General suspicions of the integrity of men in power are every where prevalent; and therefore we will *not* institute a general but a specific inquiry.” Now this does appear to us to be much the same kind of reasoning as if a ship-captain, having great reason to suspect the universal sea-worthiness of his vessel, should still chuse to examine only this cable or that anchor. The fact is, and it is stated by both parties, that suspicions are indeed, general enough: Mr. CANNING says, that public men are represented “as having nothing in view but the emolument of office,” and that there is a “persuasion alive in the public mind, that rottenness and corruption exists in every part of the state.” But if such is the allowed persuasion, how is it to be eradicated? By prohibiting inquiry into the truth of it? No! this is only increasing the suspicion, and rendering improvement hopeless. That the emoluments of office have *some* influence over the minds of those who accept them, is clear; because we see them, upon their very acceptance, bargaining for lucrative resignations, for accessory sinecures, for pensions for their mothers, sisters, sons, and nephews; and to say that this love of the public money is so nicely circumscribed that it will only tempt men to do dirty actions, but can in no case prevail on them to commit dishonest ones, seems to be drawing a very nice line of distinction.—Besides, who are they that tell us that the public suspicions are altogether unfounded? Why, the very men who assured us that there were no abuses in the Commander in Chief's office: and look how much this illustrious person has been injured by them. In his case, say they, “suspicions exist,

“ and therefore examine into the grounds of them: you cannot make the Inquiry too public.” But now observe how their tone is altered, and how much wiser they are become by experience: “Suspicions,” say they again, “exist, and therefore don't enquire into them at all; it only keeps alive the public ferment.” Yet surely if an experiment was to have been made, a less exalted personage might have been chosen as the subject of it; and such we believe is the loyalty of this kingdom, that most people will regret that *his* wings have been singed, on finding that those who thrust him into the flame are resolved not to come within smell of the smoke. But these are among the misfortunes that attend men of no party. It was a grievous damage that his ROYAL HIGHNESS suffered by that detested pamphlet published in the course of last summer. And while we are speaking of the dangers which thus attend men of no party, we shall venture to add further, that if Colonel WARDLE, who possesses that character, had six months ago confessed himself to have offered East India patronage for a seat in Parliament, such would have been the virtuous indignation of that Assembly, that he would never have sat long enough therein to have preferred his charges: nay, if under an imputation of this kind he had ventured to hint the slightest suspicion against any man in office, there would have been such a cry raised against him, as would have stunned us all; so that he had better look to himself in future.

“ If they can catch him once upon the hip,
“ They will feed fat the ancient grudge they bear
“ him.”

Something, too, has been said of the malignity with which public men are assailed; but do public men never assail others with malignity? Who first applied the odious term of infamy to an hypothetical failure in proving an honest accusation? A public man. Who branded his fellow-subjects with the accursed appellation of Jacobins? A public man. Who cheered *him* with applauses, that might be heard from Westminster to Guildhall? Public men. And what has been the consequence? that the expressions “noble,” “worthy of confidence,” “candid object,” “venal,” have been re-echoed by the detestable men from Guildhall to yours, and the recalcitrant men from the other side of the House? Who they are that have withheld from the public this foolish warfare, they consider a considerable period first complain.—That the publication of accounts in the public ferment in the public Committee

possible to deny; and that it will be kept alive by inquiry, we fully concede to those who assert it; for it is the discovery of corruption, and not of purity, that has produced the ferment: and the same cause which first provoked is most likely to increase it. But are not the ebullitions of anger preferable to the gloom of despair? From a prosecuted inquiry, what can ensue but the detection of offenders? From a stifled one, nothing but the indiscriminate confusion of the innocent and guilty. It has been said, that such a Committee as that which was moved for is unprecedented. Are not the grounds of suspicion unprecedented? Who would have ever thought of such discoveries as have been recently brought to light? When was it ever declared by a resolution of the Body Corporate of London, that a variety of "abuses discovered, formed "only a part of a wicked and corrupt "system long acted upon;" "that the "management of public affairs was in the "hands of the greatest pensioners and re- "versionists in the kingdom;" "that a "pernicious influence existed, corrupting "and undermining the free principles of "the British Constitution." Let any man look at the important place which the proceedings of that Body occupy in the pages of even our most compendious histories, and then let him say whether such a resolution ought to be passed by unheeded.

REPORT RELATING TO THE DUTCH COMMISSIONERS.

Your Committee, having derived from the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings of the Committees on Public Expenditure of the preceding Sessions referred to them by the House, some material information respecting the establishment and the transactions of the Commissioners for the Sale, Management, and Disposal of Dutch Property, captured or detained on the occasion of the commencement of hostilities with Holland, in consequence of its invasion by the French, have pursued the investigation of that subject, and proceed to report upon it.—The Commissioners, who were five in number, were appointed in ¹⁷⁹³ under the authority of the 21st clause of Geo. 3. c. 80; and their Commission reciting in the words of the *Cargoes of Dutch Ships, captured in, might perish or be lost if some provision was not made for saving the same, authorizes the Commissioners to take such Ships and*

Cargoes under their care, and to manage, sell, and dispose of the same according to such Instructions as they should from time to time receive from the King in Council."—The Lords of the Privy Council in their Instructions dated 13 June 1795, direct the Commissioners generally as to the conduct of their transactions, and require them to keep minutes of all their proceedings, and to "keep accounts in such form as the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury shall direct or approve." No instructions appear to have proceeded from the Board of Treasury, and the Commissioners represent themselves to have undertaken their office, without having come to any understanding with any branch of the government respecting the manner of deriving their Compensation for their Services, or the amount of it.—They state, that they were charged with the investigation of numerous claims to British and neutral property found in the detained and captured vessels, and, in many cases acted in a judicial character in this respect; that they received a separate and special commission to take the management of sundry Dutch vessels brought into Ireland; that they had to make arrangements with the East India Company respecting cargoes directed to be sold by the Company at their own sales; that they had to adjust many complicated accounts with their agents at the outports, and to settle the wages of the officers and crews both of the vessels of which the cargoes were sold by the East India Company, and of those which were intrusted altogether to their own management, and that they found the duties of their office to be for some time extremely difficult and laborious. They observe however, that their sales ceased, and their transactions were nearly brought to a close in July 1799, but that the final adjustment of them had been protracted partly by "small sales of remnants not completed till Nov. 1801," partly by some "property claimed in the Court of Admiralty not adjudged till July 1803," partly by "unsettled accounts with the executor of the late King's Proctor, of which the balance was not paid till Jan. last," but chiefly by an important lawsuit commenced in 1797, which brought into question property to the amount of about 180,000*l.* The suit has within these few months terminated in their favour, and the Commissioners now expect that in the course of the ensuing summer they shall close their transactions, and deliver in

their accounts to government.—It appears by a paper dated 29th April 1808, that the gross amount of the produce of the ships and of the ships and cargoes sold (of which cargoes your committee perceive that much the larger part was sold by the East India Company) was £.1,937,064

The Charges were £.631,239	
Commission charged 88,104	
Restitutions to Claimants - 69,988	
Grant to Captors - 117,746	
	907,137

Leaving a net amount of -	1,029,927
From which was further to be deducted on account of loss on ships in debt (that is, on ships the charges on which exceeded the proceeds) -	52,657

Leaving at that time the estimated net sum of - 977,269—The chief part of the balance now in hand is invested in government or other securities, which run at interest. The sum of 900,000*l.* has been paid at sundry periods to government, and having been carried to the account of the Consolidated Fund, has been applied to the purposes prescribed by parliament.

Your Committee now proceed to offer some Observations on a variety of points to which their attention has been called, referring to the Appendix for a more detailed account of some of the circumstances which they shall notice.—It has been already mentioned, that no agreement in respect to the mode or amount of remuneration was made at the time when the Commissioners were appointed. The difficulty of ascertaining beforehand the degree of trouble to be incurred, and the nature of the duties to be performed, may form, in some cases, a sufficient motive for suspending the determination of both the amount and manner of an allowance. But no circumstances have appeared which furnish a justification of the delay of no less than 14 years, which in this instance has taken place. It belonged to the government, after the lapse of a moderate period, to take up the consideration of the remuneration due to the Commissioners, with a view to its being submitted to parliament; and when the subject had manifestly escaped attention, the Commissioners ought to have given notice of the omission. But they have to this day held no communication with any branch of the

government on this question. Under these circumstances they had, in the judgment of your Committee, no right to appropriate any sums to themselves as compensation; indeed the terms of their Commission, already quoted, direct them to dispose of the Dutch Property intrusted to them only “according to such Instructions as they should receive from the King in Council,” and the Instructions accordingly given, since they merely authorize allowances to crews in payment of wages, do not appear to your Committee in any degree to sanction such application of their funds. The 26th clause of 35 Geo. 3, authorizes the payment of “the Expences of the Sales out of the Proceeds,” but the term “Expences” cannot, in the judgment of your Committee, be construed to include the payment of remuneration to the Commissioners, since neither the mode nor the amount of it had been sanctioned by the government.—It appears, however, that the Commissioners, at a very early period, proceeded both to determine in the first instance for themselves the rate of compensation due, and also actually to apply it to their own use, intending to make mention of this point only on the final settlement of their affairs, though they have from time to time had to communicate with the secretary of the Treasury on other matters, and have transmitted to the Lords of the Privy Council some general statements. The Compensation which they have taken has been a commission of 5 per cent. on the gross produce of the Sales, a subject on which your Committee will offer some further Remarks toward the conclusion of this Report. It has been charged on the principle of a mercantile transaction; but it is here observable, that they have deviated from the custom of merchants, by taking large sums for commission before they had either received or paid over the whole net proceeds of the cargoes, on the gross produce of which the commission was charged, and also before they had rendered up their accounts.—Your committee deem it necessary to animadvert on the length of time which has been suffered to elapse without rendering any regular accounts, and without their being called for by the government.—The chief object of examination in such cases is the detection and rectification of errors, and the recovery of sums improperly withheld from the public; but when any considerable period has passed, the elucidation of accounts is rendered difficult, as your Committee

have experienced in the course of the present investigation, and the recovery of money becomes a measure of harshness. The Commissioner, on whom the Financial Department is said to have devolved, is lately dead: and the want of recollection observable in many parts of the annexed Evidence, is a further exemplification of the inconvenience resulting from the long delay which has taken place.—Your Committee called for a copy of such Statements of the transactions of the Commissioners as had from time to time been delivered by them to the Board of Treasury. The chief paper furnished in return is dated 20th July 1796, being the copy of a Report presented to the Privy Council, which was evidently furnished rather with a view of shewing the sum then deemed likely to accrue from the Sale of Dutch Property, than of submitting the transactions of the Commissioners to examination. It is observable that although in this Report, which is in a great measure an estimate, the total amount of the charges incurred is given, and several particulars composing them are specified, no mention of Commission is made, though it was undoubtedly an item at that time sufficiently large to have been included in the enumeration; for under this head, the sum of 25,000*l.* had been then divided. This omission might lead to a supposition that no commission had been taken.—In the case of successive sales of a similar kind made by merchants acting as factors, it is the custom to make up separate accounts of the several cargoes, until the delivery of which the charge of commission is delayed, and also to render an annual account current, detailing all the receipts and payments of the year. If the transactions of the Commissioners are to be considered as of a mercantile nature, the public ought not to be without the benefit of those checks upon the conduct of their agents which have been generally established among Merchants.—The act authorizing the appointment of the Commissioners, contains a clause “requiring” that they shall “cause the proceeds of their “Sales,” after “payment of the duties and “the expences,” to be paid “into the “Bank of England, there to remain sub-“ject to such orders as his Majesty, with “the advice of his Privy Council, may “from time to time think fit to give there-“upon,” or as the Court of Admiralty may think fit to give in the case of sales made under the authority of that court. Your Committee expected that the cash of the

commissioners would, in pursuance of this clause, have been kept solely at the Bank, but they find that it was during the first year lodged only with a private banker, and that five private bankers have been occasionally employed, each of the commissioners having recommended that a temporary account should be opened with the banker with whom he was individually connected. The clause does not appear to have escaped the attention of the Commissioners; but it is stated in the evidence, that they understood it to apply, not to all the proceeds of their sales as they arose, but to the surplus of the proceeds above the sums expected by them to be wanted for charges and current payments. They have retained a large balance of cash for these purposes, and they represent that they were obliged to do this, because otherwise an order of his Majesty in council for a supply of cash, would from time to time have been necessary, the money paid into the Bank under the direction of the Act being no longer subject to the call of the Commissioners. They further state, that being authorized by the 23d clause of the 35 Geo. 3, c. 80. to restore all goods which should be proved to belong to neutrals, and having sold most of such goods before the decision of the claims, they deemed it necessary to retain cash sufficient for this purpose.—Your Committee nevertheless cannot approve of the construction which the Commissioners have given to the law. Their payments into the Bank appear to have been large payments made with a view to their immediate transfer from thence into the Exchequer; but the terms used in the Act are, that the proceeds, after payment of the duty and expences of sale, were to be paid into the Bank, “and remain there;” an expression which implies, that the cash was not merely to pass through the Bank in its way to the Exchequer, but was to be lodged in the Bank as a place of safe custody, in order to await the direction of the Privy Council. The legislature, however, seems not to have anticipated the circumstance of certain sums being necessary to be withdrawn from the amount of the proceeds in hand, with a view both to the payment of charges and to the restitutions of property due to neutrals; and, by not providing very specifically or conveniently for these objects, it has afforded some countenance to that interpretation of the law which has taken place.—Your Committee think, that the difficulty which opposed the adoption of a

strict construction of the Act, has been much overstated by the Commissioners. At the commencement of their transactions, having no money in hand for current payments, they obtained an Order of Council, directing £25,000 to be advanced to them in order to supply their immediate occasions, which sum was to be replaced by the subsequent proceeds of sales. They might afterwards have obtained successive Orders of Council for similar purposes, as well as for the satisfaction of claimants, without any great inconvenience; and in this case the lords of the Privy Council would have had the opportunity of exercising their judgment as to the amount of the money proper to be placed at the disposal of the Commissioners. A less objectionable mode of proceeding, though not conformable to the Act, would have been to keep two accounts with the Bank; the one, an account of money paid in under the Act, and consequently subject only to the Orders of the king in Council; the other a separate account, subject to the controul of the Commissioners. This expedient was resorted to after the first twelve months, but there was still no relinquishment of the practice of keeping a large balance with private bankers. On the supposition of any uncertainty as to the construction of the Act, the subject ought to have been distinctly submitted to the lords of the Privy Council in pursuance of their instructions, which had directed an application to themselves "in all cases of doubt or difficulty."—Your Committee are further of opinion, that if the Act had been silent on this topic, the Commissioners ought to have lodged their cash in the Bank of England, and with a view to future cases they think that it may be useful to suggest the following general Reasons:—First, The public have an interest in thus preferring the Bank, which is nearly similar to that which the Commissioners may individually be supposed to have had in favouring their respective bankers. Indeed, since the Report on the Bank of England, made by the former Committee on Public Expenditure, in which the average amount of the government balances in the Bank was stated, that Corporation has consented to make some compensation for benefit of this kind, by affording to the public the loan of a considerable sum without interest. A general intention of employing the Bank of England as the banker of the public, was then professed; and there can be no doubt that every preference shewn to the

Bank ought now to be considered as contributing to the liberal fulfilment of the general conditions of that arrangement, and even though not repaid by a specific compensation, as producing some corresponding advantages.—The more safe custody of the public money entrusted to the Commissioners, is another motive for lodging it in the Bank. Your Committee conceive, that in the case of any loss arising out of the confidence which the Commissioners have placed in private banks (an event, in the present high state of credit, admitted to be extremely improbable) the Commissioners would have been personally responsible. There is a third reason for this preference of the Bank of England, which is not less important. The Bank makes no allowance of interest, and shews no species of favour to the individual who places in it a considerable balance of cash. The public accountants, who keep cash in the Bank, are therefore under no temptation to render their balances unnecessarily large, and are likely not to fail in the punctuality of their payments into the Exchequer.—Your Committee have next to notice the too great magnitude of the balances of cash which appear in the cash-book of the Commissioners, especially during a large part of the two first years, a subject not unconnected with the preceding observations.—The paper in the Appendix shews the balance to have been, at the end of Oct. 1795, about 100,000*l.* and to have gradually risen by the end of April 1796, to above 200,000*l.* between which period and the end of May 1797 it fell to about 160,000*l.* It fluctuated between about 80 and 120,000 during the next four years, and between 50 and 70,000 during almost the whole succeeding period.—Your committee have learnt by their inspection of the minute-book of the commissioners, that on the 25th Feb. 1796, information was asked on the part of Mr. Pitt, whether any and what sum then in hand arising from the disposal of Dutch property, could be paid into the exchequer for the service of the current year; and that the Commissioners replied, that no payment of consequence into the Bank according to the act of parliament could be made, unless the Treasury should first move the lords of the Privy Council to direct the India Company to pay a sum (amounting to about 118,000*l.*) then due from the Company to the Commissioners.—At the time of this application, the balance in hand, the amount of which appears not to have been stated to the Treasury,

was about 190,000*l.* and it was never so low as 150,000*l.* in the course of the next 15 months, a balance apparently much more than sufficient to allow of a payment of 50,000*l.* (the sum usually transferred at one time) into the Bank under the Act. The Commissioners state to your Committee, that demands upon them to the amount of not less than about 260,000*l.* were then outstanding; but this sum must obviously comprise the payments which were to be expected in a long succeeding period, for all the actual payments of the following 16 months (if a sum of 50,000*l.* paid to government on the 30th June 1796, and of 40,000*l.* transferred on 31st Dec. 1796 to the Commissioners, on account of commission, and of about 49,000*l.* paid to captors, which had been previously received from the East India Company for that purpose within the same period, are excepted) amounted to only about 143,000*l.* according to a statement of the Commissioners. These payments are undoubtedly no exact or very sure criterion of the sum which might fairly be considered on the 25th Feb. 1796, as likely to be wanted. They however furnish a strong presumption on the subject, and the circumstance of the 50,000*l.* just mentioned having been afforded to government, besides 40,000*l.* to the Commissioners, a few months after the 25th Feb. 1796, without producing a reduction of the balance below 150,000*l.* affords additional reason for thinking that there was no sufficient ground for objecting to make a payment into the Exchequer as desired. It is further observable, that the Commissioners in their statement on this subject to your Committee, omit to mention the sums which in Feb. 1796, they might expect to receive. The sums actually received in the first fifteen of the above-mentioned sixteen months, (exclusive of the 49,000*l.* which were both received from the East India Company, and paid over to captors as already stated) appear by a paper called for by your Committee, to have been more than equal to the sum paid in the corresponding period, if the before mentioned payments of 50,000*l.* to government and 40,000*l.* to the Commissioners are included. It is moreover observable, that a sum of from 86,000*l.* to 665,000*l.* (which in conformity to a clause in 35 Geo. 3. ch. 80. was gathering interest at 4 per cent.) lay in the hands of the East India Company from the beginning of March 1796 to March 1798, being the produce of sales made by them from time to time on account of the Commissioners, a part of which

fund, supposing a proper understanding on this subject to have subsisted between the Commissioners, the government, and the East India Company, might have been convertible to the purpose of supplying the Commissioners with the means of meeting some of the demands coming unexpectedly upon them. It is therefore on the whole presumable, that at the time of the application in question, a further augmentation of the large balance already in hand, rather than a diminution of it, was reasonably to be expected.—Your Committee cannot contemplate the magnitude of the balances as they appear in the cash book of the Commissioners, without expressing an opinion, that (supposing it allowable for the Commissioners to adopt that construction of the Act which they have given to it) these balances ought to have been made productive by investing a very large proportion of them in Exchequer bills for the benefit of the public. Probably not less than between 40 and 50,000*l.* would have accrued in the way of interest from a due attention to economy on the part of the Commissioners in this particular, and the employment of the chief part of their large cash for such a purpose would have constituted a much better apology than has been offered by them for withholding from the Bank the sums which the Act, according to the strict construction of it, required to be paid into it, and would unquestionably have been the most convenient arrangement.—In the year 1799, a sum of 27,000*l.* due to captors, was turned to this use, which, through the accumulation of interest, amounted to 38,553*l.* at the time when it was paid; and a sum of about 33,000*l.* has been obtained for interest on the balances in the hands of the East India Company.—It has indeed been discovered in the progress of these inquiries, that the Commissioners have availed themselves of the opportunity so obviously afforded them of rendering their balances productive, but that they employed them, during the years which preceded the completion of their sales, entirely with a view to their own emolument. They have invested a part of them in Exchequer bills, a part in India bonds, and a small part in the very exceptionable article of bills of exchange on private individuals, which they have discounted.—No minute was made of any Resolution of the Board to employ any part of the cash in hand in this manner, and no proof of such employment of it appears among the receipts and payments of the cash book; the balances

anding on
tween the
, and the
been con-
lying the
f meeting
xpectedly
the whole
the applica-
mentation
nd, rather
onably to
e cannot
e balances
ok of the
ng an op-
le for the
nstruction
en to it)
een made
arge pro-
lls for the
y not less
ould have
om a due
rt of the
, and the
heir large
ve consti-
has been
from the
ording to
red to be
stionably
arrange-
f 27,000l.
this use,
n of inte-
the time
of about
terest on
the East In-
en disco-
inquiries,
ed them-
ously af-
balances
ed them,
the com-
h a view
have in-
uer bills,
all part
article of
dividuals,
o minute
he Board
hand in
employ-
eipts and
balances

of which therefore do not exhibit, as they ought to do, the amount of cash in the hands of the Bank, and of the several bankers, but include the sum lent out at interest: neither has any trace of the transaction been exhibited in any account, nor any mention of it been made to government, except that at about the same time when it was stated to the Committee on Public Expenditure, the Treasury were furnished with a copy of the Statement. The Committee itself did not at once receive correct or explicit information on this point. It will appear by the papers and evidence annexed, that on the 2nd of March 1807, the Commissioners were directed (nearly in the same terms in which the heads of other offices were required to furnish their returns) to give an "Account of their Establishment and Names, how paid, Salary, Fees, and other Emoluments, and amount of their Receipts on an average of the last three years." The Commissioners stated in their return, that they had "no Salary, Fees or Emoluments, they being paid the usual Commission on the sale of the property placed under their care, out of which they paid salaries to clerks, and all other expences of their establishment;" and they proceeded to say, that "their sales having ceased from the year 1798, and consequently their commission also, they expected to be allowed, on the final settlement of their accounts, a reasonable remuneration for their services since that period." In an examination of one of the Commissioners which took place a week after, he having mentioned that "a sum had been invested for the benefit of captors," was thereupon asked, "What was the amount of the sum vested in Public Securities?" and he replied, "about 27,000l. for the captors, and the whole remainder is invested also in public securities, which we shall account for to government (when we close our accounts) with Interest."—In an explanatory Paper, delivered to the Committee a fortnight after this examination, the Commissioners, after stating, "that they have taken particular care from time to time not to retain a larger balance than was necessary to meet the exigencies to which they were liable," add, that "they have invested the greatest part of that money in public securities, with a view of making it productive while it remained in their hands." They then say, that "they consider themselves accountable to go-

"vernment for the Interest thus accruing." These expressions seem to your Committee to imply, that they considered themselves accountable to government for whatever interest they had at any time received by lending the balances in hand, with the exception only of that portion of interest for which they had represented themselves as accountable to captors. They further observe in this explanatory Paper, that "on the other hand, having received no commission since the year 1799, they conceive that the services they have since rendered will not be more than adequately compensated by that Interest, &c." But when the Commissioners were specifically required, by a subsequent Order of 9th March 1808, to render "an account of Interest and Benefit of any kind derived from the possession of any Money which, in virtue of their Commission, may from time to time have remained in their hands, and of which no account had been rendered to the Treasury," they took a distinction between two considerable sums, received by them for interest at different periods, the one a sum of about 18,000l. (or of about 16,000l. according to a subsequently corrected Statement) received for interest before the completion of their sales; the other, a sum of about 26,000l. received after that period; and they remarked, that "it is for the last of these sums that they have declared themselves ready to account;" but that as to the smaller sum, first received, "they have only kept an account of it as between themselves." They have declared themselves unable to furnish, from their private papers, all the information which has been asked respecting the sum first received, but they confidently remark, that the profit thus made is not more than the sum stated.—They endeavour to establish their title to the sum first received partly by claiming interest on their balances as a privilege common to public accountants, and partly by observing, that the sum in question is not equal to certain sums which they had relinquished, though entitled to them. The chief sum said to be so relinquished is that part of their commission which had been applied by them to the payment of the expences of their establishment (amounting to about 15,000l.) from the burthen of supporting which they now claimed a right to be exempt, although, in their original Return, they had professed to charge themselves with it. Another sum, which they take credit for having

relinquished, consists of some commission which they forbore to charge to captors, but the reason assigned for this renunciation is one which your committee cannot countenance or approve.—Annexed is a Paper transmitted by one of the Commissioners, in explanation of the meaning of the expressions used in their first return; but, in the judgment of your Committee, it has not removed the ground of any of the preceding Observations.—Your Committee now proceed to the last point on which it is necessary to dwell, namely, the Amount and Mode of Remuneration which, under all the circumstances of the present case, seem the most proper to be adopted.—The following is the amount of the Profits which were stated on the 10th Feb. 1809, to have been received by the Commissioners :

Commission at five per-cent. on the gross proceeds of their sales, after paying charges of their establishment	- - - - -	£.74,137
Brokerage	- - - - -	4,346
Interest	- - - - -	36,458
Making together		<u>£.114,941</u>

It was then also stated, that a further sum had been received, or was receivable, for Interest, which would make the profits of the Commissioners - - - 124,785

Subject to a deduction of	-	1,587
Making		<u>123,198</u>
They have expected for Commission a further sum of about	- - - - -	10,000
Making the total profits received, and expected, about		<u>133,198</u>

Much the larger part of their Commission has been charged on property sold for them by the East India Company, who, by a clause in 37 Geo. 3. c. 80. were allowed five-per-cent. for their expence in effecting such sales.—The Commissioners, in their first Return, have termed a commission of five-per-cent. on the gross proceeds of their sales, “the usual commission;” but two and a half per-cent. on the gross proceeds is the highest rate common among merchants, and is the rate charged by them in the case of goods sold through the medium of the East India Company. The interest which the Commissioners have derived from the great balance of cash in their hands is not warranted by mercantile practice, an exact

interest account being generally kept between merchants selling on commission and their employers, to whom indeed they frequently make large advances; and a commission of two and a half per-cent. is, therefore, to be considered as in some measure a recompence for that accommodation. It may be further remarked, that the extraordinary magnitude of the sales of the commissioners form a reasonable ground for keeping down the rate of commission. This principle was urged in the Report of the Committee on Public Offices upon the Bank, with a reference to the allowance made for the management of the public debt, and has been since acted upon; and it no less evidently applies to the present case.—But the grounds on which the Commissioners have preferred their claim to a Commission of five per-cent. on the gross proceeds in their more recent statements, have chiefly been, a precedent for that allowance, supposed to have been afforded in the case of a similar Commission issued in the war of 1756, and the general practice of prize agents.

—The Commissioners state themselves to have derived their intelligence on the former of these points from a conversation with the late Mr. Aufrere, one of the commissioners in 1756, but their information is very imperfect and incorrect; and the Commissioner who gave Evidence before your Committee, professed not to know whether the commission was charged on the gross or on the net amount of the proceeds of the sales. It appears by some authentic documents on this subject, of which copies are annexed, that a commission of two and a half per-cent. on the net proceeds having been granted, out of which various undefined expences were to be defrayed, the commissioners represented these expences (which, according to their construction of the term, included brokerage and various other charges besides those of their establishment) to amount to more than their commission; and that a commission of two and a half per-cent. on the net proceeds of sales, independently of all expences, was consequently substituted. A copy of the entry in the account presented to the Treasury by the Auditor, after the termination of the transactions under this commission, is inserted in the Appendix, by which it appears that the total sum paid for commission was £.14,768. 3s.—It was divided among 14 Commissioners.—The rate of commission charged by prize agents has been fixed by long usage at five per-cent.;

[636] except be-
mission
eed they
; and a
cent. is,
in some
commo-
ked, that
he sales
asonable
of com-
d in the
c Offices
to the
ment of
ce acted
plies to
ands on
ferred
ive per-
ir more
been, a
posed to
a similar
of 1756,
agents.
elves to
the for-
ion with
commis-
nation is
and the
e before
to know
rged on
the pro-
by some
ject, of
commis-
n the net
out of
were to
present-
ding to
cluded
rages be-
(ent) to
mission;
d a half
ales, in-
s conse-
the entry
treasury
ation of
sion, is
h it ap-
commis-
divided
rate of
nts has
-cent. ;

and has lately been applied by the law to the net proceeds of sale, having before been charged on the gross proceeds. It appears by the evidence, that the excess of the commission of prize agents above that of merchants is justified chiefly by the peculiar trouble imposed on the prize agent in the distribution of the proceeds of his sales among the crews of the capturing vessels, a trouble from which the Commissioners for the Sale of Dutch Property were exempt. If also the capital employed by the prize agent, and the responsibility and risk to which he is subject, are taken into consideration, little disparity between the two charges will be found.—Your Committee will now present an Estimate of the Remuneration, to which the Commissioners would be entitled according to each of the three principles which have been mentioned.—First, If the commission usual among merchants of two and a half per cent. on the *gross* proceeds of sales should be granted, about 50,000*l.* would be the amount of the allowance, out of which the expences of the Establishment (in all about 17,000*l.*) would be to be defrayed, leaving about 33,000*l.* clear profit to be divided among the Commissioners.—2dly. If the principle adopted in 1756, of two and a half per cent, on the *net* proceeds, (which may amount to about 1,300,000*l.* or 1,400,000*l.*) should be resorted to, a sum of about 32,500*l.* to 35,000*l.* would be receivable, which, the expences of the establishment being paid, would leave about 15,500*l.* to 18,000*l.* to be divided among the Commissioners.—3dly. If the commission should be calculated at the rate which was usual among prize agents at the time when the Commissioners began to act, namely, five per-cent. on the gross proceeds of sales, the sum would be about 99,000*l.* subject to a similar deduction, leaving a clear profit of about 82,000*l.*—Your Committee can by no means agree to decide the question according to this principle. The Commission received by prize agents at the time when the Commissioners were appointed, has lately been determined to be a more than adequate remuneration for the whole of their trouble. It should also be recollected that the Commissioners not only have been exempt from the labour of distributing the proceeds of their sales among the individual sailors concerned in the captures, and from much other trouble and responsibility, as well as from the advances to which prize agents are subject, but are also enabled, by the magnitude of the sum on

which their Commission is charged, to transact the public business at a much lower rate than is fairly due to individuals receiving ordinary consignments.—On the whole, your Committee recommend that a Commission of five per-cent. on the *net* proceeds of sales should be allowed to the Commissioners, they paying the charges of their establishment.—This allowance will probably amount to not less than about 50,000*l.* or 10,000*l.* to each Commissioner, and will be more by about 17,000*l.* than would be due to them, according to the usual practice of merchants, and more by at least about 32,000*l.* than they could claim according to the precedent of 1756, to which they have appealed.—The excess of this remuneration above that enjoyed by merchants, as well as above that granted in 1756, may be justified on the ground partly of the more than ordinary trouble imposed on the present Commissioners, and partly by the length of time during which their Commission has necessarily subsisted, and perhaps partly also by the circumstance of your Committee, in consequence of the omission not only of the Commissioners, but also of the government, having to recommend a retrospective arrangement. The sum which the Commissioners will have to refund, in case of the adoption of this suggestion, will be not less than between 60 and 70,000*l.* They will also fail to receive nearly 20,000*l.* which they appear to have expected to appropriate to their own use, for further interest and commission.—Your Committee cannot allow any weight to the observation, that two of the Commissioners having, after a term, quitted their professions with a view to the fulfilment of their trust, some reference should be made to this circumstance in estimating the amount of the remuneration. No notice of the intended sacrifice was given; and it is obvious, that by proportioning the general compensation receivable by the Body to the special claims of two Individuals, a more than adequate reward would be granted to the majority.—If it should be thought fit to adopt the suggestion of your Committee, the Commissioners ought to be credited in account for the proposed Commission, and to be debited for all sums applied to their own use, since they have been taken without due authority, the same general principles being observed by the auditors in the settlement of the concerns of these Commissioners which are usual in similar cases.—Your Committee further suggest, that the Commissioners should be directed

to use their utmost diligence to make up and transmit their accounts to the lords of his Majesty's Privy Council, with a view to their being submitted to the Board of Treasury, and by them referred to the Auditors.—Your Committee have not pursued their examination of all the topics to which their attention has been called, as will be seen by the evidence, partly because such investigation might detain them too long from their inquiries into other subjects, and partly on the ground of their not wishing to be considered as exempting the government from the duty of applying their attention to the transactions of the Commissioners, or the auditors from the diligent and exact performance of the functions of their important office. The magnitude of the charges on the vessels and cargoes sold, which manifests itself in the difference between the gross and the net proceeds, and in the excess of the charges above the whole proceeds in the case of many vessels, appear to demand attention.—Your Committee have had it chiefly in their view to examine and animadvert upon those points which derive importance either from the magnitude of the saving in question, or from their involving some general principles, on which it might be material to insist.—On a review of the whole of the subject which has been before them, they beg leave generally to remark, that to commit pecuniary trusts of extraordinary magnitude to persons, however respectable as individuals, and however qualified for their employment by the habits of their former lives, without settling, during a long course of years, the mode or amount of their remuneration,—without providing any material check on their proceedings,—and without reminding them of their responsibility by calling for any regular or periodical account, is a neglect which may be expected often to lead to equally prejudicial consequences, and is a deviation from the acknowledged duty, and also, as your Committee trust, from the ordinary practice of government.

PROCEEDINGS

In COUNTIES, CITIES, BOROUGHS, &c. relative to the recent INQUIRY in the House of Commons, respecting the Conduct of the DUKE OF YORK. (Continued from p. 568.)

TOWN OF GODALMING.

At a Meeting of the Corporation and principal Inhabitants of the Town of Godalming, held at the Town Hall, in pursuance of a Requisition for that purpose, to the Warden of the Town, on Monday, the 27th day of March, 1809.

It was (with the exception of two only) unanimously resolved, That an Address from the Corporation and Inhabitants of this Town be forthwith prepared and presented to G. L. Wardle, esq., M. P. thanking him for the manly and patriotic spirit by which he so peculiarly distinguished himself as a Member of Parliament, in bringing forward and prosecuting the Inquiry in the House of Commons into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

That Mr. Weale the Warden, and Mr. Haydon, a Member of the said Corporation, be deputed to present such Address, and that they do forthwith consult Mr. Wardle as to the most convenient time for his receiving the same.

That these Resolutions be entered on the Records of the said Corporation, as a lasting memorial of the opinion entertained by the Corporation and Inhabitants of this Town of Mr. Wardle's Parliamentary Services, and as a Tribute of their grateful acknowledgments to him.

THE ADDRESS.

To G. L. Wardle, esq. M. P.

Godalming, 27th March, 1809.

SIR;—WE the undersigned Members of the Corporation, and principal Inhabitants of the Town of Godalming, this day assembled at the Town Hall, in pursuance of a Requisition for that purpose to the Warden of the Town, feeling convinced that Corruption in any Government must necessarily tend to weaken its own just Authority, and admiring that manly and patriotic spirit by which you so peculiarly distinguished yourself as a Member in Parliament, in bringing forward and prosecuting the Inquiry in the House of Commons, into the Conduct of the late Commander in Chief, desire to offer you our most sincere and hearty thanks, and as a lasting memorial of the opinion we entertain of your Parliamentary Services, we have caused this Tribute of Acknowledgment to be entered on the Records of the said Corporation.

(Here follow the signatures.)